

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOUTHERN BAPTISTS SPEAK
OUT FOR HOUSING

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that a witness appears before one of our committees with testimony that speaks so concisely and vividly about the circumstances of our times. One of those times came on March 25, 1982, when Dr. M. Wendell Belew, director of mission ministries, the home mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention appeared before the Subcommittee on Housing of our Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. His testimony set forth the kind of partnership of mutual support by the Government and the private sector, with particular emphasis upon the church for the housing of our elderly and poor that has long existed to provide for those who are the least among us, which is now being threatened.

The church can contribute to the spiritual and moral needs of the families whose help must come from others; but, it is the State—our Government—that must provide the funds. To cut the housing budget by more than \$32 billion is to send a message to those who are wanting and who are the least among us that ours is a Government "of the people and by the people" so long as they are not of low income who have a need for housing and other forms of assistance. Surely that is not the message we want to send. Surely that is not the message we in this Congress will permit this Nation to send.

This testimony is filled with poignant examples of the need for housing by our elderly, our handicapped, and our poor. I urge Members to consider not only the philosophical questions about the role of Government which are raised in this statement but to ask themselves how they would have our local communities, our private sector resources, and our charitable institutions meet this challenge. If the answer is that the challenge is to be met with Government assistance, I would urge that the funds for housing be reinstated.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY DR. M. WENDELL BELEW

Southern Baptists are a very diverse group. Ours is a membership made up of 80 different racial and ethnic groups. There are approximately 36,000 churches affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention.

The constituency numbers approximately 13,600,000. These are in all of the states and major communities of the United States. I do not presume to speak for all of the membership of our churches but I do bear a special responsibility as the director of missions ministries on behalf of Southern Baptists.

Our constituency is very heavily involved in many programs of ministry. We are concerned about how people live and whether or not they have adequate food, clothing and housing. It is to the latter point that I wish to address this body, to express a deep concern about what I think is happening in our land today.

Southern Baptists are strong proponents of the separation of church and state. Yet we are churches within the state and believe that a partnership of mutual support, especially in the area of housing, can be accomplished. Each entity, church or state, provides resources which the other cannot. The project is funded, or low interest rates provided, by the state. The church can contribute a spiritual and moral example for the building of families and community.

For nearly a half century our nation's government has been involved in producing low income housing. In Atlanta, Georgia where the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention has its headquarters, the first low income housing project (the Techwood Development) was completed in 1935. This project has had a remarkable effect upon its community. Some of its former residents have become leaders in our city and churches. It has had strong involvement with the Tabernacle Baptist Church, which is located nearby and the Baptist Home Mission Board helps to support a mission center in the Techwood community. Through these nearly 50 years, this project has been a symbol of what good government could do for those who did not have the best opportunities for housing.

Although funds for renovation are being drastically reduced, the local housing authority was able to utilize existing HUD funds to begin the renovation of this complex. It again will be a residence for those who will become leaders of our city and other cities of the world, a good example of what public housing can do.

Tragically, however, after nearly half a century of good experience in providing for low income persons, elderly poor persons, and in providing low income persons with assistance in the purchase of properties and in many other areas, this most humane program of public assistance is being destroyed. Recommendations for FY83 housing assistance would indicate that our government "of the public and by the people" is not especially for low income people, who are tragically in need of housing. Can it be possible that our nation will devise techniques and funding for a military establishment capable of maiming or killing half the people of the world but remain incapable of maintaining adequate housing in our nation? The proposed 1983 budget provides \$32,000,000,000 less than the amount needed to maintain federal housing programs at their present levels.

Thirty-seven percent or \$23 billion of this cut comes from low income housing programming, the largest cut proposed for any

activity of the federal government in 1983. In future years, it is projected there will be consideration of a rescission of appropriations for new and rehabilitated assisted housing units. There is an effort, really, to get rid of many existing subsidized units and to raise rents to the point where federally subsidized low income housing may cost more than unsubsidized housing.

Southern Baptist churches, and those of many other denominations, have been involved in the building of low income housing for the elderly. Recently, I visited such a complex that had been made possible through 202 funds provided by the Housing Administration. As I conversed with some of the residents of this complex, I was thankful for a government that had cared enough and for churches who had been willing to expand their energies and expertise to join in the production of a facility which brought such happiness to the lives of people.

I recall the days when we took care of our poor in what we called "county farms" or "poorhouses." Many of our neighbors dreaded the possible thought of spending their latter years in a poorhouse, with every vestige of pride destroyed, waiting patiently to die. But the residents of this complex which I was privileged to visit, were happy, their dignity preserved, and living in attractive surroundings. Our churches, synagogues, and religious institutions in cooperation with a beneficent government have been able to provide a new kind of dignity for low income persons. The poor have not, in these instances, been depreciated because they were poor. They have been paying part of their way.

But, then, this may be the final chapter for such communities as this, for it is projected that such new units will not be built again on a scale adequate to accommodate the needs. Hundreds of low income units already approved for subsidy will never be built or rehabilitated because the subsidy commitments will be withdrawn. Hundreds of thousands of commitments for new rehabilitated housing units already approved under the Section 8 and Public Housing Programs face cancellation. Some 300,000 of the 700,000 units which are in the process of being developed will be lost. This loss comes at a time when affordable rental housing units are shrinking rapidly and when one-fifth of all construction workers are unemployed.

In most cities there are long waiting lists of those who are seeking to enter low income housing projects of various categories. There are as many as 5,000 on the waiting list in Atlanta. An official with the Birmingham housing authority told me recently of their opening of a new project of approximately 200 units. After they had advertised the opening of these units and the date for accepting applicants, there was a line three blocks long that continued for three days, seeking to become certified for living in that particular project. We have heard of instances where there were people who waited from ten to fifteen years in order to get into low income housing projects.

Perhaps among the most effective of the federally funded programs have been the self-help programs. These projects have been of as great a benefit to the American Indians as perhaps any programs that have been offered. The American Indian's income is the lowest in our nation. But at last there appeared signs that someone cared. Navajos, Pueblos, Sandia, Jicarilla Apaches, the Navajos of Canyoncito, and many other tribes became apprised of a self-help program wherein government funds were provided for a site and materials, and the Indian family could erect a house. Church members from some of our 500 Southern Baptist America Indian churches helped to facilitate the building of some of these government funded "self-help" houses. But if the proposed funding of houses for Indians is enacted there will be no more help—for Indians. It would appear that the old cowboy and Indian game is being reenacted—and that the Indian loses once more.

Dr. Sam Simpson is a Southern Baptist pastor who works in the South Bronx. Two recent presidents have visited that area and have noted the devastation that has been wrought there by housing that has been destroyed, or has become uninhabitable. Dr. Simpson and other pastors of the area have set about to form an organization to rehabilitate the area. These are the Bronx Shepherds, an interdenominational organization of religious leaders in the Bronx.

During the past year, five work teams from Southern Baptist Churches in the South have gone to New York City and helped the Shepherds rebuild and refurbish 135 apartments in five buildings there. The apartments will eventually be sold to the tenants. These work teams are volunteer skilled laborers—electricians, plumbers, contractors, who have been willing to give their vacation time or have taken personal leave in order to go to this devastated area and express love the best way they know how. Obviously, they have made a considerable impact with the refurbishing of 135 apartments. With cutbacks in federal funds which have been available for housing renovation (and this has been the source of the funds that have been used for the basic materials) no new work can be done in the years ahead.

Mr. Bob Davis, who is a deputy housing commissioner for the city of New York, said that his department manages more than 35,000 apartments which the city has taken over from owners who have not paid their taxes and 14,000 of these are now in various stages of ownership assumption by about 25 different community housing and tenant organizations such as the Shepherds. These people, Davis says, are the way of the future. They are a rare and unique group of people.

And yet, as willing as these volunteers may be to assist their fellow-man and to recognize their neighbor, it is not possible for them or the thousands of others like them to do all of the job by themselves.

Certainly, it is important that churches and benevolent organizations do the best they can to assist in as many ways as possible to correct the horrifying housing shortages for poor, and especially for the elderly; but it is not possible for them to do that alone.

Not only is it not possible, it is not just that a government which is supported by these people, becomes so calloused and oblivious to the hurts of their own land that it refuses to even become a partner with those who would seek to make an effort, to provide adequate housing for needy.

Another disastrous implication of proposed legislation on housing, or perhaps non-support legislation, will affect rents in the lower income housing arenas. Possibly as many as three million families will see their rent increased at a time when unemployment is at its highest and inflation eats away at the basic meager incomes of so many. The administration is proposing legislation to require tenants to pay their utility bills and to count food stamps as income. In every instance this would vastly increase the rent, not leaving any funds for basic necessities.

To suggest that the private sector is going to step in now and meet the needs that have been previously met by the government is certainly far from realistic. The private sector is not especially interested in low income housing. We cannot expect a trickle-down effect from those who are builders (what few of them are able still to build). The most lucrative investments in housing come in the area of condominiums and upper income housing. As many apartment complexes are converted into condominiums, those who are occupants are forced to leave. Even in low and middle income groups, escalation of rents is forcing them out of the kind of housing which they have comfortably enjoyed into kinds of housing that are totally inadequate. Widows on fixed incomes, though above the poverty level, are unable in many places of the United States, to find adequate housing in the private sector.

Mildred McWhorter, director of our mission work in Houston, Texas informs me of the plight of a Spanish-American mother and five children. The children are from the ages of six to thirteen. The husband deserted some six years ago, and the mother has worked as best she could find work in two part-time jobs. She does not speak English very well. She cannot get a job. She has asked for federal help for house rent and utilities but this is not available. There is no aid available in the county or state. She is receiving aid through our Baptist mission center, but this aid cannot continue long, because there are hundreds more in situations such as she.

In the same city, a grandmother, with four small children (taken in from negligent alcoholic parents) is in desperation. She and the children exist in vacant buildings or a temporary shelter. She walks many blocks to our mission center simply to earn food and clothing for the children. How many more are there such as this? If the "supply side" economy is going to work it should begin working soon in one of America's wealthiest cities.

One of our workers in New Mexico has told me of the very successful project developed in Las Cruces. Del Cerro is a housing development in which HUD has provided a low interest loan for low income persons to purchase units. This splendid development has provided a unique opportunity for Hispanics who live in the area. That these citizens of our nation have been able to find a good place to live and be able to feel the pride of ownership is really a part of what has been the American dream. They have not been given much—just a low interest loan. They are paying for their houses. But is the dream now ended? With the proposed new federalism it may well be.

The proposed legislation will reduce the number of low income housing units and reduce the number of projects that had been approved and could be approved for renovation. This makes rentals climb to the

point where they are no longer affordable even by those who are already poor. Housing has been curtailed at a time when need for housing is at its most critical point perhaps in 25 years. An added crunch for housing is coming because our population is getting older and many individuals are retiring from the work force on limited fixed (or perhaps shakily fixed) incomes. With Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare benefits threatened, many of these who are retiring can not afford to live in their pre-retirement housing. Where do they go? A middle income widow I know has moved three times recently because her rent was radically increased. She is pathetically hurt and frightened.

A recent study by economist Shirley H. Ryan indicates that the rapid growth of America's older generation is posing major problems for both government and business policy makers. The study shows that the number of people 60 and over is increasing considerably faster than the rest of the population, up to 16 percent from 12 percent in 1950. It is estimated by the year 2000, 24 percent of the population will be 60 and over. The 60+ population is expected to increase four times as fast as the under-60 group in the next half century. The eighty plus population will grow even faster.

Is it not incredible, then, that in the light of this rapidly increasing elderly population we have no ability or perhaps no concern, to provide them with adequate shelter? Many of these are living alone. Their families are gone and there is no one really to care. The churches and synagogues will try to help but their major financial responsibility is not housing. It had been our thought that, as persons of good will became involved in government, they would be able to enunciate the principles that have so long been a part of our caring nation.

Is it not incredible that acres of housing, which could well change the whole nature of the community, the state and nation, can be supplanted by one aircraft carrier?

Is it not incredible that as we seek to gain superiority or equality with Russia in military strength, we also gain equality with them in housing and are forced to pile our impoverished multitudes in small room with inadequate heating or other conveniences.

If there are those who believe that federally funded housing has been misused, and that many projects have not been well managed, they would be correct. There have been projects that have been misplaced and allowed to deteriorate; but this is not the majority of the housing projects. The cause has often been that the projects did not have adequate funds for repair. The proposed FY83 budget would decrease the funds for repair even further.

I would encourage you to look afresh at the priorities of this budget to ascertain what is the best for our land, to see these expenditures not just in terms of dollars and cents, but rather in terms of people cringing in the shadows of vacant houses, hunting for a place of warmth, seeking to gather their children about them, but with no place to lay their heads.

I would encourage you to remember the priorities of our land that has given to us leadership from poverty, presidents from log cabins, and which has helped us to know that any home can be a castle.

Lewis Harris Spence, the court-appointed receiver of the Boston Housing Authority, has said, "I propose that if we allow the apparent current trends to advance unabated, the consequences for our poor and for the

life of our community more generally will be horrific. The simple arithmetic of housing availability will increasingly confine the poor to smaller and smaller enclaves in ever more squalid conditions at ever more unbearable cost. When this occurs, today's phrase 'social tension and discrimination' will mock the enormity of conflict between races and classes that will ensue."

Mr. Spence was well aware of what is happening in Boston. By the spring of 1981 over 400 rental units in Boston had been converted to condominiums. That form of ownership is more heavily subsidized through tax deductions than rental housing. In Boston the current rental vacancy is 2 percent. Less than 5 percent is considered extremely tight.

In 1981, the typical cost to rent a two-bedroom unit was \$400-\$500 a month. Roughly, one-third of Boston's population, or some 200,000 people are poor or near poor. They depend for their shelter on three segments of Boston's housing market—public housing, privately owned subsidized housing, and unsubsidized private rental housing. And all three are shrinking.

Mr. Spence has further noted, "The distress of public housing—the collapse of order and community among the residents of our projects—is, I believe, a paradigm of the condition we increasingly impose upon the poor. The chaos which pervades our troubled projects is only a dramatic example of the more general deterioration of life in poor communities. That is not widely enough understood. The dynamic which degrades life in the project is at work no less effectively, if less intensively, in all poor neighborhoods. The chaos which pervades life in public housing and other poor communities is the same chaos which threatens to degrade life for all of us. If the current dynamic continues and the conditions of poverty are aggravated, if we are to reclaim tranquility for the larger community, we must first reclaim it for poor communities. There can be no quietude for all of us while chaos prevails for some of us. That is only just. It is the condition of community and nationhood that our welfares are knit together. Only a wellbeing that is shared can be assured."

I appeal to you, then, you who long have represented the needs of our nation well. Do not permit this tragedy to happen to the poor, the young, the elderly. It is for such causes that governments are made. In the absence of just concern there can only grow anger, chaos and anarchy. All the armaments we can build can never protect us from ourselves. We may be creating an explosion and planting it in our very midst.●

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS CELEBRATES 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Knights of Columbus celebrated the 100th anniversary of their order's founding. As we congratulate them on this special occasion, it is well to recall the many accomplishments of this splendid organization which are outlined in the following article from the Catholic Standard:

[From the Catholic Standard, Mar. 25, 1982]

100TH BIRTHDAY NEARS FOR KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

(By Norman McCarthy)

Father Michael J. McGivney, the young curate at St. Mary's Church in New Haven, Conn., knew poverty first-hand. His father's death at an early age left him with the responsibility of providing for eight younger brothers and sisters by working in a spoon factory in his native Waterbury.

He also knew poverty through his ministry at St. Mary's, a parish of Irish immigrant laborers. In 1882 the lot of an Irish immigrant family was far from a happy one. The father, exploited and broken in health by working long hours in dangerous or unhealthy working conditions, died young, often leaving a young widow and several children.

The plight of these widows and orphans and the knowledge that many young, Catholic men were joining secret societies for their insurance benefits led Father McGivney to propose a Catholic fraternal organization in New Haven—the Knights of Columbus.

After several months of preparation, Father McGivney and 25 New Haven laymen gathered on March 29, 1882, at St. Mary's to establish the Knights of Columbus to help Catholic laymen remain steadfast in their faith, to promote fraternities and—significantly—to set up a system of insurance so widows and children of members would not find themselves impoverished.

Father McGivney, never strong physically, died of pneumonia at age 38 on Aug. 14, 1890, only eight years after the founding of the Knights. As an indication of his zeal, there were 56 Knights of Columbus councils in Connecticut at the time of his death.

From the small beginning 100 years ago at St. Mary's Church, the society has grown to more than 1.35 million members affiliated with 7,156 councils. More than one million Knights live in the United States.

The work of the Knights of Columbus, both on a national and international scale, is immense, but most of the activities are handled on the local level. In 1980 individual Knights distributed \$31.7 million for various activities to help the handicapped, the elderly, the young and others. They also donated 9.2 million volunteer hours to community and church services. Among the Washington institutions helped are SOME (So Others Might Eat), Martha's Table, the House of Ruth and the Spanish Catholic Center.

Next month the D.C. councils will conduct their annual Tootsie Roll charity drive to benefit institutions working with the mentally retarded and emotionally handicapped. The Maryland councils conducted their Tootsie Roll drive—a national campaign held at various times—earlier this year.

By choosing Columbus as their patron, the founders were stressing Catholic legitimacy in the predominantly Protestant culture 100 years ago. Their strong pride in being American and Catholic eventually led to the forming the Fourth Degree Knights, who have patriotic work as their goal.

This patriotism also led the Knights to establish Knights of Columbus "Huts" as recreational facilities of U.S. troops fighting on the Mexican border against Pancho Villa in 1916 and then in Europe during World War I. This \$40 million venture in World War I carried an invitation to the Huts set up near the front: "Everybody welcome, everything free."

The 1920s were a busy time for the society. Involved in a long battle with the Ku Klux Klan over Catholic bigotry, the Knights also set up a million dollar fund to help Mexicans fight Catholic persecution in that country. The decade also saw the successful fight against an Oregon law that would have prevented children from attending parochial schools. The law was found unconstitutional in 1925 by the Supreme Court.

The Knights funded the construction of the Knights' Tower at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and donated the bells for it. They also established the "Luke E. Hart Memorial Fund" in 1979 to promote Marian devotion at the shrine.

The society led the campaign to insert "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance. The Knights now spend \$1 million to publicize Catholic truths and to foster Judeo-Christian values through the print and electronic media. They also arranged for the microfilming of 11 million pages of valuable documents in the Vatican library.

The total service provided by the Knights of Columbus is unmeasurable—fostering vocations, promoting devotion to the Blessed Mother and the rosary, family life, pro-life, Boy Scout troops and Columbian Squire circles.

Over the past century the goals of Father McGivney and the founders have been carried forward until today there are more than one million Catholic men who dedicate themselves to his ideals and to those of the Knights of Columbus—charity, unity, fraternity.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that my husband, Hale, and many other Members of this House have been among them.●

THE IRS STRIKES—A CPA

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), is the following letter from a certified public accountant in a Northwest State.

DEAR SIR: I have recently been banged on by the IRS. A local agent made a mathematical error, in favor of the IRS, in the amount of \$4,000 in computing my tax for a prior year. I was told by an IRS official that they recognized the error, but that I would have to go to Tax Court to have the error corrected.

The element of fear when dealing with the IRS must be stopped.

The seizure of property without a court order must be stopped.

It is a violation of my rights as a U.S. citizen to be assumed to be guilty until I prove myself innocent.

A person arrested for murder receives fairer treatment than the average taxpayer does when dealing with the IRS.●

NUCLEAR ARMS FREEZE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the authoritative newsletter, *Information Digest*, which primarily focuses on political and social movements in the United States which may aid foreign governments or movements to the detriment of U.S. interests, has followed the activities of the disarmament movement in this country and Europe. A recent *Information Digest* article entitled "Nuclear Arms Freeze," appearing in the March 12 issue, reviewed the campaign in the State of Connecticut in support of a nuclear arms freeze. I would draw the attention of my colleagues to the following article:

[From the *Information Digest*, Mar. 12, 1982]

NUCLEAR ARMS FREEZE

On February 24, 1982, the Connecticut General Assembly became the country's fourth state legislature to pass a resolution calling for a joint U.S.-Soviet "nuclear freeze"—an immediate halt to development, testing and deployment of any further strategic nuclear weapons. The Connecticut House of Representatives had endorsed the resolution on February 3; the state Senate vote was a 35 to 1 voice vote.

According to a front-page story in the *Hartford Courant* (2/25/82), the support for the "nuclear freeze" resolution was organized by State representative Irving J. Stolberg, of New Haven, who was characterized as "an ardent advocate of arms control." Stolberg is one of a number of U.S. State and local elected legislators active with the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council (WPC) and the U.S. Peace Council (USPC) who have taken leading roles in promoting "nuclear freeze" resolutions in state assemblies and city councils.

It was reported that the Connecticut Republican state lawmakers went along with the "nuclear freeze" idea because the Reagan Administration had taken no position on the matter and because they believed there was no conflict between the measure and the Administration's arms control position. Six of eight members of Connecticut's U.S. Congressmen from both parties have endorsed the "nuclear freeze" proposal. In the U.S. Congress, nuclear freeze resolutions have been co-sponsored by 17 Senators and 122 Representatives. On March 10, Secretary of State Haig criticized the "nuclear freeze" resolutions during testimony; the next day State Department Director of Politico-Military Affairs Richard R. Burt read a formal State Department statement that the "nuclear freeze" would place the U.S. at a military disadvantage because the USSR has superiority in ICBMs and intermediate-range missiles.

The Connecticut Campaign for a U.S.-U.S.S.R. Nuclear Freeze last year had persuaded residents of three towns to pass freeze resolutions in town meetings. Coordinators of the campaign are Bruce Martin and Marta Daniels, both on the staff of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). Last November, during the presen-

tation of the Promoting Enduring Peace (PEP) 1981 Ghandi Peace Award to Corliss Lamont, long-time leader of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (NECLC), a Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA) front and who was identified in sworn testimony of multiple witnesses as a CPUSA member, Daniels spoke of addressing a disarmament rally of 250,000 in London's Hyde Park on dismantling NATO's nuclear weapons capability.

Also, on 2/24/82, in Danbury, Conn., supporters of the Connecticut Campaign for a U.S.-U.S.S.R. Nuclear Arms Freeze held a meeting at Western Connecticut State College.

With more than 100 people participating, Fr. Joseph Infantine, a Franciscan, acted opened the meeting by introducing Sr. Mary Friel, S.N.D., active in the anti-El Salvador campaign and who blames the present liberal junta of El Salvador for "50 years . . . (of) rigged elections and the assassination of popular leaders." A film of a San Francisco seminar by Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) was shown to advertise PSR speakers slated for a March 13th meeting in Farmington, CT. The PSR film included an assertion by Dr. H. Jack Geiger of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) that it is a breach of medical ethics for a physician to participate in planning for emergency medical services in the event of a nuclear attack. The theme of the film and PSR in general is that no human being will survive any nuclear conflict and that the use of a single nuclear weapon, tactical or strategic, will inevitably lead to total nuclear war.

The featured speaker was William Caldicott, M.D., husband of PSR leader Helen Caldicott, a Boston pediatrician who recently gave up her practice to become a full-time disarmament organizer for PSR. Caldicott attacked the U.S. as not sufficiently committed to arms control and was sharply critical of the shelving of the unratified SALT II treaty. Caldicott said he viewed the presence last year of 14 high-level Soviet scientists and physicians at a U.S. conference of IPPNW as a sign the Soviets are eager for arms control.

With only two informed members of the audience speaking in opposition to the "nuclear freeze" campaign, supporters of the campaign in the audience offered what observers considered a well-orchestrated series of "what is to be done" questions that led to Fr. Infantine's presentation of the "nuclear freeze" petition for signatures.

It is noted that the endorsers of the "Call for a Bilateral Nuclear Freeze" distributed by the AFSC and Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC) include Richard Barnet, Institute for Policy Studies (IPS); Rep. Ron Dellums (D-CA); Freeman Dyson, physicist, Institute for Advanced Studies; Richard Falk; Bernard Feld, editor, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*; Randall Forsberg, Institute for Defense & Disarmament Studies (IDDS); John Kenneth Galbraith; Dan Gaby, president, Keyes-Martin & Co.; Jerome Grossman, director, Council for a Liveable World (CLW); Adam Hochschild, Mother Jones, Robert Johansen, president, Institute for World Order (IWO); George Kistiakowski, Carl Marcy; Rep. Toby Moffett (D-CT); Michael Meyerson, director, U.S. Peace Council; Rep. Richard Ottinger (D-NY); George Rathjens, MIT; Victor Sidel, M.D., PSR; and Reps. Frederick Richmond (D-NY), Charles Rangel (D-NY), Peter Rodino (D-NJ), Harold Washington (D-IL), James Weaver (D-OR), and Ted Weiss (D-NY).●

CONGRESSIONAL WALKAMERICA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 31, 1982, at the U.S. Capitol, the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, whose national headquarters is located in my congressional district in White Plains, N.Y., is sponsoring a national kickoff for its WalkAmerica campaign.

One hundred and fifty Senators and Representatives from 47 States have signed up for this event called Congressional WalkAmerica, the March 31 symbolic kickoff for the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation's nationwide gala fundraising event, WalkAmerica '82.

The legislators will assemble at noon on the Capitol Grounds to show their support for the prevention of birth defects, and urge their constituents to join WalkAmerica's organized by March of Dimes local chapters for the April 24-25 weekend.

Participants in the 30-kilometer community walks raise funds through pledges for the distances they cover. Last year's effort raised \$18 million. The funds support March of Dimes research, medical service, and education programs to fight America's major child health problem—birth defects.

The following is a full list of the acceptances through yesterday:

CONGRESSIONAL WALKAMERICA ACCEPTANCES
THROUGH MARCH 23, 1982

ALABAMA

Sen. Howell T. Heflin (D).
Rep. William L. Dickinson (R—Montgomery/S.E. Alabama).

ALASKA

Sen. Frank H. Murkowski (R).

ARIZONA

Sen. Barry Goldwater (R).
Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D).
Rep. Morris K. Udall (D—Tucson).

ARKANSAS

CALIFORNIA

Sen. Alan Cranston (D).
Sen. S.I. Hayakawa (R).
Rep. Eugene A. Chappie (R—N.E. California/Redding/Chico).
Rep. Don H. Clausen (R—N.W. California Coast/Eureka/Santa Rosa).
Rep. Robert T. Matsui (D—Sacramento).
Rep. Bobbi Fiedler (R—Los Angeles/San Fernando Valley).
Rep. William M. Thomas (R—Bakersfield).
Rep. Daniel E. Lungren (R—Long Beach).
Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D—Los Angeles).
Rep. Tony Coelho (D—Merced).
Rep. Jerry Lewis (R—San Bernardino).
Rep. Norman Y. Mineta (D—San Jose).
Rep. Jerry M. Patterson (D—Orange County).
Rep. Wayne R. Grisham (R—S.E. Los Angeles County/Whittier/Downey/Norwalk).
Rep. Duncan L. Hunter (R—San Diego).

Rep. Mervyn M. Dymally (D—Los Angeles).
Rep. Bill Lowery (R—San Diego).
Rep. Tom Lantos (D—San Francisco/Bay Area/San Mateo County).

COLORADO

Rep. Kenneth B. Kramer (R—Denver Suburbs/Colorado Springs).
Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D—Denver).
Rep. Timothy E. Wirth (D—Suburban Denver/Boulder).

CONNECTICUT

Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly (D—Hartford).
Rep. Samuel Gejdenson (D—Eastern Connecticut/New London).

DELAWARE

Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (D).

FLORIDA

Sen. Paula Hawkins (R).
Rep. L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (R—West Palm Beach/Ft. Myers/Naples).
Rep. Bill McCollum (R—Orlando/Clearwater).
Rep. Bill Nelson (D—Brevard County/Melbourne).
Rep. Clay Shaw (R—Broward County).

GEORGIA

Sen. Mack Mattingly (R).
Rep. Billy Lee Evans (D—Macon/South Central Georgia).
Rep. Jack Brinkley (D—Columbus/Warner/Robbins/West Central Georgia).
Rep. Wyche Fowler, Jr. (D—Atlanta).
Rep. Edgar L. Jenkins (D—Northeast Georgia).

HAWAII

Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D).
Sen. Spark M. Matsunaga (D).

IDAHO

Sen. James A. McClure (R).

ILLINOIS

Sen. Charles H. Percy (R).
Rep. Philip M. Crane (R—Northwest Chicago/Suburbs).
Rep. Paul Simon (D—Southern Illinois/Carbondale).
Rep. Lynn Martin (R—Rockford).
Rep. Marty Russo (D—Chicago).
Rep. George M. O'Brien (R—Joliet).
Rep. Cardiss Collins (D—Chicago).

INDIANA

Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R).
Rep. Lee H. Hamilton (D—S.E. Indiana/Columbus).
Rep. Dan R. Coats (R—Fort Wayne).
Rep. Adam Benjamin, Jr. (D—Gary).
Rep. Philip R. Sharp (D—Muncie).

IOWA

Rep. Thomas J. Tauke (R—Dubuque).

KANSAS

Rep. Bob Whittaker (R—Emporia/S.E. Kansas).

KENTUCKY

Rep. Larry J. Hopkins (R—Lexington/Frankfort).

LOUISIANA

Sen. Russell B. Long (D).

MAINE

MARYLAND

Rep. Barbara A. Mikulski (D—Baltimore).
Rep. Michael D. Barnes (D—Montgomery County).
Rep. Beverly B. Byron (D—Western Maryland/Frederick/Howard County).

MASSACHUSETTS

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D).

Rep. Joseph D. Early (D—Worcester).
Rep. Barney Frank (D—Suburban Boston/Newton/Brookline).
Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D—Boston).

MICHIGAN

Rep. William S. Broomfield (R—Oakland County/Suburban Detroit).
Rep. Robert W. Davis (R—Marquette/Upper Peninsula).

MINNESOTA

Sen. Rudy Boschwitz (R).
Rep. Arlen I. Erdahl (R—St. Paul).
Rep. Martin O. Sabo (D—Minneapolis).
Rep. Bruce F. Vento (D—St. Paul/Minneapolis).

MISSISSIPPI

Rep. Wayne Dowdy (D—Jackson/Vicksburg/Natchez).

MISSOURI

Rep. Wendell Bailey (R—Central Missouri/Jefferson City).
Rep. Bill Emerson (R—Cape Girardeau/S.E. Missouri).
Rep. Ike Skelton (D—Independence).

MONTANA

Sen. Max Baucus (D).

NEBRASKA

Rep. Douglas K. Bereuter (R—Eastern Nebraska/Lincoln).

NEVADA

Rep. Jim Santini (D).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sen. Gordon J. Humphrey (R).

NEW JERSEY

Rep. Matthew J. Rinaldo (R—Elizabeth/Union).
Rep. Robert A. Roe (D—Passaic/Patterson).

NEW MEXICO

Sen. Harrison H. Schmitt (R).

NEW YORK

Sen. Alfonse M. D'Amato (R).
Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D—NYC/Mahattan).
Rep. Leo C. Zeferetti (D—Brooklyn/NYC).
Rep. Theodore S. Weiss (D—Manhattan/NYC).
Rep. Joseph P. Addabbo (D—Queens/NYC).
Rep. Donald J. Mitchell (R—Utica).
Rep. Raymond J. McGrath (R—Long Island).
Rep. Richard L. Ottinger (D—Westchester County).
Rep. Henry J. Nowak (D—Niagara Falls).
Rep. Frank Horton (R—Rochester).
Rep. Norman F. Lent (R—Long Island).
Rep. George C. Wortley (R—Syracuse).
Rep. Peter A. Peyser (D—Westchester/Bronx).
Rep. Guy Molinari (R—Staten Island).

NORTH CAROLINA

Rep. Stephen L. Neal (D—Winston-Salem).
Rep. W. G. (Bill) Hefner (D—Central North Carolina).
Rep. Eugene (Gene) Johnston (R—Greensboro).
Rep. Ike Andrews (R—Durham).

NORTH DAKOTA

Sen. Quentin N. Burdick (D).

OHIO

Rep. Chalmers P. Wylie (R—Columbus and Suburbs).
Rep. J. William Stanton (R—N.E. Ohio).
Rep. John F. Seiberling (D—Akron).

Rep. Louis Stokes (D—Cleveland).
Rep. Dennis E. Eckart (D—Cleveland).

OKLAHOMA

Sen. Don Nickles (R).
Rep. James R. Jones (D—Tulsa).

OREGON

Sen. Bob Packwood (R).

PENNSYLVANIA

Sen. Arlen Specter (R).
Rep. Bob Edgar (D—Suburban Philadelphia/Delaware County).
Rep. William F. Goodling (R—York).
Rep. Don Ritter (R—Eastern/Bethlehem/Allentown).
Rep. James L. Nelligan (R—Wilkes-Barre/Hazleton).
Rep. William F. Clinger, Jr. (R—State College/North Central Pa.).
Rep. Gus Yatron (D—Reading).
Rep. Thomas M. Foglietta (D—Philadelphia).
Rep. Allen E. Ertel (D—Williamsport).
Rep. Don Bailey (D—Westmoreland County).
Rep. Austin J. Murphy (D—Southwestern Pa.).

RHODE ISLAND

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D).
Rep. Carroll Campbell, Jr. (R—Greenville/Spartanburg).
Rep. Thomas F. Hartnett (R—Charleston).
Rep. Kenneth L. Holland (D—Rock Hill/North Central S.C.).

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sen. James Abdnor (R).
Sen. Larry Pressler (R).
Rep. Thomas A. Daschle (D—Aberdeen/Sioux Falls).

TENNESSEE

Sen. James R. Sasser (D).

TEXAS

Sen. Lloyd M. Bentsen (D).
Rep. James M. Collins (R—Dallas).
Rep. E. (Kika) de la Garza (D—Southern Texas/Brownsville).
Rep. Kent R. Hance (D—Lubbock/Midland).
Rep. James C. Wright, Jr. (D—Ft. Worth).
Rep. Jack Hightower (D—Amarillo/Panhandle).
Rep. J. Marvin Leath (D—Waco).
Rep. Martin Frost (D—Dallas/Ft. Worth).
Rep. Tom Loeffler (R—Suburban San Antonio/San Angelo).

UTAH

Sen. Jake Garn (R).
Rep. James V. Hansen (R—N.E. Utah).

VERMONT

Sen. Robert T. Stafford (R).
Rep. James M. Jeffords (R—entire State).

VIRGINIA

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D).
Sen. John W. Warner (R).
Rep. J. Kenneth Robinson (R—Winchester/Harrisonburg/Charlottesville/Fredericksburg).
Rep. Stanford E. (Stan) Parris (R—Suburban Washington/Northern Va. Suburbs/Fairfax Co.).
Rep. Robert W. Daniel, Jr. (D—Petersburg/Portsmouth).
Rep. G. William Whitehurst (R—Norfolk).

WASHINGTON

Sen. Slade Gorton (R).
Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D).

Rep. Sid Morrison (R—Yakima/Richland/Vancouver/Central Washington).

WEST VIRGINIA

Sen. Jennings Randolph (D).

Rep. Mick Staton (R—Charleston).

Rep. Cleve Benedict (R—Eastern West Virginia/Morgantown).

WISCONSIN

Sen. William Proxmire (D).

Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D—Milwaukee).

Rep. Thomas E. Petri (R—Oshkosh/Sheboygan).

Rep. David R. Obey (D—North Central Wisconsin/Wausau).

WYOMING

Rep. Dick Cheney (R).●

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS HONORS PATRICK SHEEHY

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of a distinguished architect, Patrick Evan Sheehy, who has recently been honored by the Inland Empire Chapter of the California Council, American Institute of Architects. Having seen Mr. Sheehy's work, I can understand why he has been cited.

The Inland Empire Chapter gave eight awards for work completed in 1981, three of which went to Mr. Sheehy. He was recognized for the design and planning of the Indian Wells Condominium complex in Palm Springs, Calif.; the interior design of the McCollock residence in Lake Havasu City, Ariz.; and the initial cafeteria at California State University in Bakersfield, Calif.

Patrick Sheehy has provided innovative architectural and planning services to the southwest for over 17 years. He has been recognized throughout the Nation for his technical thoroughness and his excellence in contemporary design.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sheehy believes in functional design and innovative solutions for public structures. At a time of budgetary restraint, when every dollar must be spent wisely, it is heartening to me to see an architect create designs that are both pleasing to the eye and serviceable to the public. I applaud the Inland Empire Chapter of the California Council, American Institute of Architects for recognizing Patrick Sheehy.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS COUNTRY FACES EXTREMELY SERIOUS

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the economic problems we face are extremely serious ones. The solutions will come only if we, and the President, face up to the gravity of the situation, come to grips with the budget deficit interest rate problems, and meet each other's concerns in a forthright manner.

An example of the kind of forthrightness we need here in Washington is found in a letter, from Mr. E. H. DeConingh, Jr., president of the Mueller Electric Co. of Cleveland, and a resident of my district. His analysis is clear and very self explanatory:

MUELLER ELECTRIC CO.,

Cleveland, Ohio, February 12, 1982.

Congressman DENNIS E. ECKART,
2470 Chagrin Boulevard
Beachwood, Ohio.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKART: I am writing this letter to my two Senators and to Congressmen Eckart and Oaker who respectively represent my residence location and business location.

I am aware that all of you are home for a brief period sensing the pulse of your constituency on a number of matters, principally the Federal Budget.

I am a businessman, and a lifelong registered Republican. In general I subscribe wholeheartedly to the philosophies expressed by President Reagan especially those which bear on trimming the size of the Federal Bureaucracy, and holding down the growth rate of the Federal Budget.

While I subscribe to the President's principles I believe that the method by which they are being applied to the budgetary process is in too short a time frame, resulting at least for the definable future in very heavy budget deficits. The president has indicated that there will be no tinkering with the Military budget, and I believe no tinkering with the tax cuts which the Congress voted last summer. If this is so there is not much room to maneuver, and I believe that is a serious mistake.

I believe Democrats and Republicans alike share the view that some fundamental changes should be made in the way our Federal Government operates, but the differences spring up in timing and method. I for one believe that the substantial tax cuts plus shortfall of tax revenues due to the recession is the culprit. The inevitable large budget deficits lead business men and financial people to the logical conclusion that the Federal Reserve is going to dominate the credit markets, and that therefore interest rates invariably will remain at relatively high levels. If you don't have a job, and beyond that are looking at interest rates in the midteens to buy a home or car nothing is going to go any place.

Of course I am not familiar with all the complications and political trade-offs that are behind the scenes, but I'd like to see the Congress in a responsible bipartisan way indicate to the President that the principal way to get the economy off dead center is to

reduce the size of the budget deficit, and at least from my point of view to do this with some adjustments in the tax cuts by either trimming or delaying their implementation.

If getting the economic machine going again is going to cost me some tax money beyond that presently legislated so be it.

Sincerely,

E. H. DeCONINGH, JR.,

President.●

SEPARATION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, the social security trust funds should be made off-budget; that is, they should be separated from the unified budget.

I introduced a bill to separate social security from the budget last October. It now has 75 cosponsors and is gaining steam. Three members of the new National Commission on Social Security Reform, Messrs. CONABLE, ARCHER, and PEPPER, are cosponsors of my bill. Bob Myers, Chief of Staff of the Commission and a major architect of the original social security benefit structure, believes there is "a very strong tide running in this direction." Health and Human Services Secretary Richard Schweiker testified in Ways and Means hearings that he personally likes the idea. The National Commission on Social Security recommended separation in its 1981 report.

The reasons for moving forward with separation are becoming stronger with time. Last year the social security reform process ground to a halt with cries that the budget was being balanced on the backs of the elderly and that the system was not really in financial danger. This year, greater budget cuts are being demanded than ever before in the history of our Government. Without separation we could repeat the same unsuccessful effort to convince people that there is a crisis and a need to reform social security, and we could push ourselves closer to the edge of destroying the bedrock of our Nation's social policy. Estimates now are that the system probably will run out of money by 1984.

As long as social security is part of the unified budget it is at the whim of politics. Its independent standing is weakened, and its future is threatened by moves to make it just another welfare program. Yet social security has long been the country's most popular social program because it is not welfare; its benefits are earned rights paid for by tax contributions.

The key to reestablishing the independence of social security is to return the system to the off-budget status it enjoyed from its inception to the late

1960's. By Executive order, President Johnson included the social security trust funds in the unified budget so that the Vietnam war deficit, in one stroke, actually became a surplus for 1 year. The rationale for this was political and with it came undesirable consequences for social security.

Why is there still hesitation by some to embrace separation? In large part it is because of a misunderstanding about what the unified budget process is meant to accomplish. The unified budget makes clear how much spending is being financed through deficits, and how much is being financed by current tax revenues. This in turn tells us how much inflation the Government will be fueling and how much credit the Government will be demanding.

The social security system is financed completely by social security taxes. There can be no deficit financing of the social security system as it is now. It is financially independent. Therefore including the trust funds in the unified budget only obscures the amount of deficit financing the Government is engaging in.

Separation will not reverse the drive of the early 1970's that rightfully placed general revenue spending within a unified budget. The budgeting of general revenues was a milestone victory that was hard fought. But the budgeting logic does not extend to the separately financed social security system.

The Social Security Subcommittee plans on drafting a miscellaneous social security bill in the next month or two. I hope to include the separation in it. Passage of separation, by making clear that social security benefits are not being cut to balance the budget, would establish a nonpartisan setting for achieving comprehensive social security financing reform later this year. ●

OUR GOOD NEIGHBOR

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis Club of Somerset County, Md., has chosen an extraordinary individual to be the recipient of its Distinguished Service Award. Mr. Henry J. Bailey epitomizes the ideal good neighbor—a friend whose influence extends far beyond Somerset County, Md. I have had the opportunity to know Mr. Bailey and his lovely wife, Mildred, for many years, and know that the Kiwanis Club could not have chosen a more deserving individual to honor. All of Maryland can be proud of Henry J. Bailey. Today I would like to offer to my distinguished colleagues

and the people of Maryland an article by the Somerset County Farm Bureau Women's Committee on the accomplishments of this remarkable man.

OUR GOOD NEIGHBOR, HENRY J. BAILEY

Henry J. Bailey was born in Somerset County seventy-nine years ago. Mr. Bailey and his wife, Mildred, have lived at their present home, Cherry Grove, on Stewart's Neck Road near Princess Anne for thirty-six years. They have two children, Betty Ann and Robert. Mr. and Mrs. Bailey are members of the Manokin Presbyterian Church in Princess Anne.

Mr. Bailey, affectionately known as "Mr. Henry," completed the ninth grade in high school. Mr. Henry eventually began his first love, farming. He was soon to become known as a progressive farmer and willing to listen to and try new methods of farming. His love for the land and his belief in the necessity of its preservation has made Mr. Henry one of the most respected farmers on the lower Eastern Shore. His wisdom and experience in the farming industry has led many young farmers to his farm and home for guidance. Mr. Henry has always lent his support, both physically and mentally, to young people in order for them to be given a chance that they might not otherwise have gotten. This helping hand is not exclusively extended to the young farmer. More experienced farmers also turn to Mr. Henry for advice and help when problems arise. The Bailey's farm equipment and hired help have appeared unexpectedly many times on other farms when help is needed.

Mr. Henry has always been known to have a bountiful garden. It always seemed he had a garden which produced enough vegetables to feed half of Somerset County. This abundance of vegetables was distributed proudly by Mr. Henry and Mrs. Mildred to their neighbors, friends, and any needy persons they might hear about.

Mr. Henry has always been one of the "first" to be active in community and civic organizations. He is a member of the Princess Anne Lions Club, Somerset County Farm Bureau, Chairman of Farmers Loan and Home Advisory, and serves faithfully as Chairman of the Somerset County Board of Supervisors of Elections. He has served on the A.S.C. Committee for 25 years, which he served most of the time as Chairman. Previously, he has served on the Somerset County Democratic State Central Committee and the Somerset Farmer Advisory Board.

Mr. Henry was instrumental in forming the Somerset County Farmers Cooperative Service when Southern States was proceeding to eliminate their operation in Somerset County. His leadership and initiative in organizing this Cooperative helped mold the progressive attitudes of the participating farmers, which has led to the Co-op's success.

Being one of the first 4-H members in Somerset County, Mr. Henry has always given his support to the 4-H program in the County. This is just another way his generosity has helped the youth in our County.

As stated earlier, Mr. Henry is active in the Somerset County Farm Bureau. His obvious dedication to this organization has been revealed through his determination in maintaining the membership in the County's Farm Bureau. Single-handedly, when more members were needed, Mr. Henry has gone out to the local farmers and obtained the needed members. His commitment to the principles and objectives of this organi-

zation are an inspiration to any person involved. His integrity and straight forward approach is realized by any person who has the pleasure of meeting him. For his dedication to the agricultural industry and his community, we respect and honor him.

Therefore, we, the Somerset County Farm Bureau Women's Committee, feel Mr. Henry J. Bailey is the epitome of the "Good Neighbor Award." ●

JAPANESE TRADE RESTRICTIONS

HON. EUGENE JOHNSTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, as we are all acutely aware, trade relations between the United States and Japan have been growing increasingly strained, as Japan continues to subject U.S. imports to a wide variety of trade restrictions. There has been a growing consensus both within the Government and throughout the private sector that we can no longer afford to stand idly by while Japan flagrantly takes advantage of our commitment toward encouraging international trade. In no area is Japan's protectionist trade philosophy more evident than in its import policies with respect to the tobacco industry. The marketing of tobacco products is controlled entirely by a government body called the Japanese Tobacco and Salt Monopoly, which is a branch of the Japanese Ministry of Finance. As the name implies, the Tobacco and Salt Monopoly exercises exclusive control over the advertising, distributorship, and pricing of foreign cigarettes and cigars. In practice, the Monopoly's policies severely restrict the amount of cigarettes the United States may export to Japan, through a wide range of non-tariff barriers imposed by the Monopoly. This situation persists, despite an agreement reached between the United States and the Government of Japan on November 12, 1980, which was intended to increase United States cigarette sales in the Japanese market.

In order that my colleagues might fully comprehend the degree to which Japan restricts the importation of American cigarettes, I want to take this opportunity to briefly summarize some of Japan's practices with respect to the cigarette industry. Although the Japanese Tobacco and Salt Monopoly's policies encourage the importation of U.S. tobacco for use in Japanese cigarettes, it severely restricts the importation of U.S. cigarettes. Because of its monopoly authority over the tobacco industry in Japan, only the Monopoly decides which retailer may sell domestic cigarettes and which retailer may sell both domestic and imported cigarettes. In

addition, the Tobacco and Salt Monopoly limits to 20,000 the number of licensed tobacco retailers allowed to sell imported brands, or less than 1 out of every 12 licensed tobacco retailers in Japan. The Monopoly also limits the ordering and delivery of imported brands to once a month, whereas retailers may order and get delivery of domestic brands every week if inventory needs require it. In the key markets of Tokyo and Osaka, the Tobacco and Salt Monopoly imposes a three-carton-per-brand minimum purchase quantity on retailers ordering imported cigarettes; there is no such minimum order quantity for domestic brands. Imported cigarettes are charged a 426 yen per 1,000 overhead expense for distribution in only 8 percent of the total retail outlets, while domestic brands are charged approximately 520 yen per 1,000 for 100 percent distribution and more frequent deliveries. In addition, while sales and distribution data by retailer are readily available for domestic brands, similar information is unavailable for imported brands.

These are only a few examples of the discriminatory, protectionist policies which the Government of Japan exercises with respect to the importation of U.S. cigarettes. I have always supported the concept of free trade. But the Government of Japan has demonstrated—most dramatically through its restrictive cigarette import policies—that it has no regard for the concepts of either free trade or fair trade. In view of the good faith efforts which our own Government has made to help the Japanese economy get back on its feet since World War II, I am appalled that their Government continues to practice such protectionist measures as those carried out by the Tobacco and Salt Monopoly. I cannot help but wonder how long the Japanese think that we are going to continue to put up with their protectionist trade policies, before we feel compelled to adopt similar policies ourselves with respect to their exports. In view of the growing objections both in Congress and in the American business community to Japan's import policies, I would hope that they will begin to consider, if they have not yet done so, just what kind of impact it would have on their own economy if the United States were to impose similar trade barriers on Japanese imports. I would venture to say that the impact on Japan's economy would be far more severe than that which our economy as a whole has experienced at Japan's hands. Unfortunately, we may have no choice but to rethink our own trade policies with Japan if that nation does not soon alter its import policies with respect to U.S. goods.●

HOW TO KEEP SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Foundation has done an excellent analysis of the Small Business Innovation Act, published as the enclosed editorial in *Newsday*, and has concluded that the "spirit of invention could end up at the bottom of the bureaucratic mud puddle if the Small Business Innovation Act is approved by Congress in its present form."

HOW TO KEEP SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE
(By Catherine England)

Small business plays a big part in the American economy. Look at the numbers: 97 per cent of all firms are small; they produce 43 per cent of the gross national product, 73 per cent of retail sales, 76 per cent of construction dollar volume and provide 58 per cent of private, nonagricultural employment, according to the Center for the Study of American Business.

Consider the creation of new jobs. In a survey of 5.6 million firms, David L. Birch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that between 1969 and 1976, companies with fewer than 21 employees created 66 per cent of the net number of new jobs, that is new jobs less jobs lost. During that period, firms with 500 or fewer employees created 87 per cent of the net number of new jobs.

More important, consider innovation—creating inventions or taking old ideas or processes and making them marketable. A firm develops a new laser technology, for example, or another produces an electronic filing system based on existing computer technology. The Office of Management and Budget reports that between 1953 and 1973, firms with fewer than 1,000 employees accounted for 50 per cent of all major U.S. innovations. These small businesses produced four times as many innovations per research and development employee as did larger firms. Small firms produced 24 times as many major innovations per research and development dollar as did those with more than 10,000 workers.

In an effort to spur inventive contributions by small companies, the Senate has passed the Small Business Innovation Development Act of 1981, requiring federal agencies to set aside for small businesses a small percentage of the agencies' research and development grants.

The bill breezed through the Senate, 90 to 0, and is expected to come before the House in several weeks. Despite its good intentions, though, this legislation has serious flaws. It is likely to be expensive, and experience shows that it is unlikely to work. In fact, it is likely to stifle innovation.

The Senate bill would require federal agencies with annual research and development budgets exceeding \$100 million to set aside for small businesses 1 per cent of the portion of the research and development budget that is contracted out. It would cover five big agencies. The House version would phase in a program beginning at one-half of 1 per cent and ending with a 3 per cent set aside. It would cover 13 agencies.

Proponents say these "set-asides" will help overcome a bureaucratic prejudice against small business, spur innovation and invention, give smaller companies a fairer share of federal handouts and make available to them start-up capital they could not get in the private market.

The bill's backers blame declining productivity, in part, on reduced innovation in U.S. industry. Since small businesses have a proven record of creativity, increasing research and development activities by small firms would seem to be a quick way to boost productivity. These supporters also say that small businesses have been overlooked in the allocation of federal research and development money because of a bureaucratic prejudice against them. This bias supposedly stems from the greater risk associated with small firms.

But the plan has several problems. Before the federal government jumps in and tries to make a success more successful, the situation should be carefully examined.

The assumption of bureaucratic prejudice may, in fact, be flawed. Randy Knapp, speaking for the American Electronics Association, which represents 1,900 mostly small, high-technology firms and which opposes the bill, said that smaller firms are not as active as larger companies in seeking federal grants. Rather than bureaucratic stonewalling, Knapp identifies the real deterrent as government red tape.

The social legislation and regulation of the past two decades has so complicated the procurement process that most small companies cannot afford to comply with the paperwork. It is simpler to raise private funds, which are less subject to delays in payment and approval. These delays, not uncommon in government grants, could be particularly painful for small firms.

In addition, statistics indicate that small businesses might not be underrepresented in receiving federal research and development money.

Dr. Edwin Zschau, a former management science professor and now chairman of the board and president of System Industries Inc., a computer company in Sunnyvale, Calif., has found that of all private-sector scientists and engineers, 5.5 per cent are employed by small companies. And, based on information from the Federal Procurement Data Center, Zschau found that small firms received "6.8 per cent of contract money going outside the government." This seems to indicate that small firms are receiving their fair share of federal funds.

There is also disagreement over the costs of the proposed new program. Advocates say costs will not increase because the agencies merely would be required to set aside a certain percentage of existing budgets for small businesses.

The Congressional Budget Office disagrees. To carry out the program, the budget office says in a report, agencies would have to establish special programs to administer the grants to small business.

These extra administrative costs are expected to range from \$8 million in 1982 to \$66 million by 1986. These costs are not provided for in the legislation, and proponents have not discussed the question.

Using the average National Science Foundation grant to small companies as a guideline, Zschau found that during the first year (with a 0.5 per cent set-aside requirement), more than 3,800 proposals would be funded under the measure. This is almost four times the number of new ideas small businesses get funded each year through private

investment. With the full 3 per cent set-aside, the government would be funded about 30,000 proposals per year—one for every research and development scientist or engineer employment by small businesses. Just finding that many proposals would require a massive effort. Thus, the view that costs will not increase because the bill merely earmarks a part of existing budgets is unrealistic at best.

The argument that small businesses cannot find capital in the private market for their risky beginning stage is flawed, too. Many firms start each year with such capital.

There are other questions which must be answered.

First, are set-asides desirable? Experience shows that programs like these have not been very successful. An example is a Small Business Administrative program to "develop and nurture small, minority-owner firms" by distributing noncompetitive government contracts to them. The idea was to give firms government business until they were strong enough to compete for private clients. Since 1969, more than 27,000 contracts worth \$5.5 billion have been awarded to 4,600 firms under this program. A report by the General Accounting Office, however, reveals that more than 30 per cent of these contracts firms have participated in the program for more than seven years, and many are so swamped with government contracts that they have not had the time to develop outside commercial business. Only four per cent have become self-sufficient.

Second, what is the government's proper role in research and development? In most cases, the best it can do to encourage innovation is to create the proper environment. This means leaving scientists and entrepreneurs as free as possible to pursue promising avenues. Incentives—especially for developing new ideas into marketable products—may be offered, but these should take the form of tax write-offs, patenting privileges, and the like. Usually, any further government action—funding of projects, for example—introduces rigidity into the system and inefficiencies into the market.

Except for research in the national interest but with limited commercial applicability—space exploration, weapons research or long-range basic research, for example—private funding of research is much more efficient.

If the federal government is serious about helping small businesses pursue innovations, it should remove impediments. Tax changes, such as reducing the rate on capital gains, could help small companies raise private funds. And reducing regulatory burdens would help foster an atmosphere more conducive to invention. One example is improved protection of trade secrets from unwarranted disclosure, a major concern of the chemical industry.

Perhaps smaller firms have such an outstanding record in innovation precisely because the government has not been greatly involved in their research and development activities. Invention and innovation require flexibility. Nothing stifles creativity more than rigid rule, and where the government steps in, rigidity usually follows. Furthermore, innovation is inherently risky and civil servants in general seek to avoid risk.

Therefore, the factors that have contributed to the accomplishments of small companies may be the first things destroyed by government interference.

Catherine England is an economist with The Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based public-policy think tank.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration by my colleagues a newspaper column on the separation of church and state. Its author, New Orleans Archbishop Philip M. Hannan, suggests that during the divisive debate on this subject, we have lost sight of our ultimate goal—renewing dedication to the principles that inspired the Founding Fathers to establish the United States of America.

On January 25, 1982, the Supreme Court struck down a Louisiana law allowing children to start each school day with a brief period of silent meditation. Without accepting the case for oral argument, the High Court issued a unanimous order affirming last August's decision by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals that the Louisiana statute, and a program to implement it in Jefferson Parish schools, were unconstitutional.

Supreme Court Justice Black has summarized the establishment clause of the first amendment in 'his way:

The establishment clause thus stands as an expression of principle on the part of the Founders of our Constitution that religion is too sacred, too holy, to permit its "unhallowed perversion" by a civil magistrate.

I think that Archbishop Hannan has reflected this principle quite well in his column, which recommends that school children recite segments of the Declaration of Independence at the start of each school day.

And now, for general interest, I submit his "modest proposal."

The article follows:

[From the Clarion Herald, March 4, 1982]

RENEWAL OF SPIRIT NEEDED

(By Archbishop Philip M. Hannan)

Our country needs a renewal of spirit, a fresh dedication to the principles which inspired our forefathers. The preoccupation with the complex legal struggle to maintain a separation of Church and State has inhibited that renewal. Any attempt to have prayer in public schools produces litigation instead of dedication to our principles.

Would it not serve the interests of our country and the cause of true patriotism if we encouraged the recitation at the beginning of the school day of a few paragraphs from the Declaration of Independence?

The declaration is our national charter. The recitation of several key sentences of it would instill a consciousness of the pledged goals of our country. It would renew a sense of personal dignity and responsibility. It would confer a new confidence among the nations of the world in our aspirations and intentions.

Consider what the recitation of the following sentences of the Declaration would mean to our citizens and our worldwide neighbors.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . .

"We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name and by Authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be free and independent States . . .

"And for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

These few sentences, recited before or after the Pledge of Allegiance, would aid in building a higher respect for the dignity of every person in our country. The words have a direct relationship to the formation of a better sense of social justice, a keen sense of responsibility for the welfare of the citizens and a deeper appreciation of the sacrifice entailed in the foundation of the country.

The document containing the Declaration of Independence is carefully preserved in the National Archives Building on Constitution Avenue in Washington, D.C.

More important than the preservation of the document is the acceptance of its basic principles in the minds and hearts of our people. The basic principles must be lived by our citizens if the United States of America is to achieve its destiny. ●

THE IRS STRIKES—CALLING CONGRESSMEN STUPID

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA) is the following correspondence I received from one of our colleagues in the Midwest. The first letter was sent to the Department of the Treasury by our colleague and the second is a memorandum he received from his District Office explaining the problem. This self-explanatory incident clearly shows the need for H.R. 4931.

DEAR SIR: I have enclosed a copy of a memorandum recently written to me by the Manager of (one of) my district offices. I would appreciate your taking a minute to read it.

By way of background, I recently became a cosponsor of H.R. 4931, which would limit and regulate the collection procedures of the Internal Revenue Service. I wrote my weekly newspaper column on this legisla-

tion, and outlined the reasons why I believed it should be enacted.

Although I firmly believe that the IRS personnel have every right to express their opposition to any legislation, I do object to the rude treatment that was given to my staff and me. Moreover, the note written by (my Office Manager) to (an IRS collection officer) was meant expressly for him, and frankly, I wonder where these "public servants" found the time to distribute it within their office on the taxpayers' time.

I think that this seemingly minor incident only serves to strengthen the need for legislation to restrict the Internal Revenue's power, which has been used in many cases to harass and intimidate law-abiding citizens.

MEMORANDUM

Re IRS and H.R. 4931.

To: Congressman.

From: Office manager.

Yesterday, on the way to work, I saw (name withheld) who is a collection agent for the IRS, and he and I were discussing your column concerning the IRS. He indicated to me his disapproval, along with other IRS employees who also were not too happy with the column.

When the morning mail came in I received a copy of H.R. 4931 so I thought it would be good PR between this office and the IRS office, especially (the collection agent), if I asked for his opinion on the bill and to offer any suggestions or comments he might have. (The collection agent) was out of his office so I wrote a note and attached it to the bill and laid it on his desk with the permission of his office partner.

That afternoon, (the officer in charge) of the local IRS office brought the Bill H.R. 4931 and my note to the (collection agent) up to (our Congressional office) with the word "hogwash" written on it. I explained to him that I was wanting an intelligent response, but this seemed to be the best he could do.

What really hacked me off was two things: No. 1 was the statement he made that any Congressman who would introduce a bill like this must be stupid. No. 2 is that my note and request for information was directed to the (collection agent). I resent the fact that (his office partner) took it upon himself to take my message to (the collection agent), who was out of the office, and distribute it throughout the IRS office; and that (the officer in charge) took it upon himself to give me an unintelligent opinion of "hogwash."

I then took the note and the bill back down to (the collection agent's office), who still was not in, and asked (his office partner) if I could again leave it on his desk and I asked that it be specifically left on (the collection agent's) desk since the message was for him—not anyone else. (His) reply was, "get the hell out of here and don't ever come back," which I did; but before I left I let it be known that my opinion was that his attitude sure made it all the more obvious that we need a bill such as H.R. 4931.

I then went over to (the officer in charge) office to express my total concern about his attitude or lack of concern for the taxpayer and people in general.

It is an attitude of "we are right—we are above the law—collecting taxes is the No. 1 function of the government, and there is nothing that should stand in the way of the IRS in collecting taxes—not the Congress, not the President, nor a judge."

I think this just goes to show that we need a bill such as this and the sooner we have it the better off many American taxpayers will be.●

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I visited Central America last year under the auspices of the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee. In February of this year Congressmen TOM HARKIN of Iowa, JIM OBERSTAR of Minnesota, and JIM COYNE of Pennsylvania, did the same. This trip occurred at a time when domestic doubts about American involvement in Central America are escalating dramatically. After his return from the trip, Representative HARKIN testified before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. His statement is accurate, enlightening, and carefully reasoned. It is an important piece of testimony for all to read as we consider and debate the nature and extent of U.S. involvement in Central America generally and El Salvador specifically.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR

I welcome the opportunity to testify before your committee. On February 16, I went down to visit El Salvador for three days. The trip to El Salvador was followed by a two day visit to Nicaragua. I was accompanied on this trip by Rep. James Coyne of Pennsylvania and Rep. Jim Oberstar of Minnesota.

The purpose of the first leg of our trip was to investigate the political, military and human rights situation in El Salvador. Although I had already sponsored a resolution (H.J. 399) to cut off all military aid to El Salvador, I returned there for my second visit—the first was in April—with an open mind. Of all the actors in the Salvadoran drama, I have known Napoleon Duarte the longest and the best. In fact if anything, I went down there hoping that what I saw and heard, and what President Duarte could tell me, would convince me that the U.S. is on the right track.

I will first outline the major meetings we had in El Salvador and then present my policy recommendations.

THE ARMY AND SECURITY FORCES

We met with the members of the Salvadoran military high command and several Colonels for three and one-half hours. They were very generous with their time, but not with their answers.

Before we visited with the Armed Forces we had been well briefed by the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador and by officials of the Catholic Church in El Salvador. We had also seen the many press reports on the incident in San Antonio Abad. With minor variations, the reports of these three sources concerning this incident coincided.

This is the story we heard from Colonel Palacios, Commander of the First Brigade. He told us that the First Brigade had received reports that uniformed and non-un-

formed guerillas were operating in San Antonio Abad. At 11:30 p.m. on January 30, forty to fifty Army troops set up an ambush. Then somebody saw their troops and a firefight ensued. At 7:00 a.m. the next morning, the 40-50 troops advanced from their fixed positions and they discovered that 20 civilians had been killed in the cross fire. They took these bodies, including the bodies of two women, to the morgue.

Every other report is completely at odds with this one. The Embassy sent an investigator to the morgue. He saw seventeen bodies. Most of these people had been shot in the back of the head and the investigator reported that some had powderburns clearly around each bullet hole, indicating the people had been shot at very close range. Eyewitnesses subsequently told us that the Army Forces had gone to various homes in different neighborhoods and dragged people into the streets where they shot them in cold blood.

The evidence in this case is overwhelming. The First Brigade of the Salvadoran army carried out a massacre of unarmed people in San Antonio Abad. Since then the army high command has covered up totally. It has lied to the press; it has lied to the United States government; and it has lied to us, Members of Congress. Incidents such as San Antonio Abad are not unusual in El Salvador; on a smaller scale they are a daily occurrence. What is unusual is that this time the facts are clearly documented and still the Salvadoran army refuses to acknowledge the truth.

If the Salvadoran army is serious about trying to convince the American people it wants to respect human rights, it should without delay bring charges against the officer who carried out the operation, and discipline Colonel Palacios who was responsible for the original cover up.

We also asked the high command about reports which were substantiated by the State Department that the Army of El Salvador, except in rare cases, does not take prisoners. The Subminister of Defense, Colonel Castillo, denied this and instead charged that the guerillas kill their wounded so that they cannot be interrogated. There is again no question that this is a lie. The army of El Salvador does as a matter of routine shoot the enemy wounded and execute the captured. From a military point of view, this is stupid. From a moral point of view, it is barbarous.

General Vides Casanova, Commander of the National Guard, told us that since October 1979, the Guard had cashiered 56 guardsmen—none of them officers—and sent their cases to civilian courts for criminal prosecution. General Vides Casanova stated that these men were being punished for "abuses of authority", that is, serious human rights violations. We were not allowed to take the documents with us, but we did examine them in the Defense Ministry. Our close inspection indicated that of these 56 cases, only 4 dealt clearly with the violations of victims because of their actual suspected political beliefs (the 4 American religious women). A second incident where a family was assassinated in what could have been a political crime involved 4 other guardsmen. The remainder of the 56 cases involved members of the Armed Forces who were charged with common crimes such as murder, rape and robbery not involving a political motivation, the kind of crimes which occur even in politically tranquil periods in any country.

On the face of it, this is simply not compelling evidence that the National Guard is taking seriously human rights violations. There are 4,500 National Guardsmen, of whom the majority are stationed in rural areas. They have long had a reputation for being very brutal. Even President Duarte has singled out the National Guard as a major source of violations of authority.

And yet, the military high command would have us believe there were only 2 separate incidents involving 8 guardsmen sufficiently egregious to warrant prosecution. That is asking us to believe the unbelievable.

It is also common knowledge, affirmed to us by President Duarte and the military high command, that no one has been convicted of murder in El Salvador for three years, either from the left or right. It is stated, and I have no reason to doubt it, that the civilian judges are too easily pressured from all sides and do not want to jeopardize their own or their families' lives by convicting a murderer.

We therefore asked the members of the military high command why the revolutionary junta government did not transfer to the military courts jurisdiction over "murder, rape and mayhem". They responded that the military courts only have jurisdiction over crimes which have direct military consequences: treason, desertion and other infractions of military discipline. If a soldier commits murder or rape, it is a common crime to be tried in civilian courts.

They claimed that the junta does not have the sole authority to transfer jurisdiction over crimes committed by troops and officers. The Supreme Court would also have to concur. At this writing, I cannot tell you if that is true. What does seem clear, however, is that if the military high command were truly in earnest about their pledges to control abuses, it would make every effort to establish a military court system with full powers of punishment over military personnel.

We told the Salvadoran military in very clear terms that we did not believe they could get this control until they established a system of meaningful sanctions in the military courts. Their mere efforts to do that would give their pledges more credibility in my eyes. Otherwise I will continue to believe that the military high command does not want to control the violence and in fact condones it.

We also raised the incident of El Mazote, but only in a very narrow way. I have no doubt that a massacre of some scale did occur in El Mazote in December, 1981. I also have no doubt that elements of the Atlacatl Brigade, a rapid deployment unit with an earlier reputation for paying more attention to human rights, were involved in the massacre. There continues to be wide controversy on the numbers killed and the reliability of the different lists containing the names of those allegedly killed. Consequently, we did not raise for discussion the incident itself.

Rather, we asked General Garcia to comment on his statement to a UPI reporter on January 28, 1982 that "We have absolutely no information of any operation in Mazote."

It was unbelievable that General Garcia said this to begin with, but his answer was even more difficult to believe. He stated that he understood the question to mean: Was there an operation in Mazote occurring at the time he was asked the question.

Let me put this in context. General Garcia was asked the question at least one

day after the incident was receiving widespread press attention all over the world. The operation involved 22 companies which were assembled from different army barracks all over the country. The operation was well known throughout El Salvador to have occurred in December. And yet, he first had the temerity to tell an American reporter that there was no operation in El Mazote and second to try to cover up his first lie by saying that he misunderstood the question. It is a minor point, but it is one more indication that the Salvadoran military high command is totally unwilling to tell the truth to either the American press or the American Congress; and I can assure you that it is equally disingenuous in discussions with officials of the State and Defense Departments.

Colonel Francisco Moran, commander of the Treasury Police, was also present at some of the meetings we held. You might remember that following the murders of four American churchwomen there were hurried consultations in December between Christian Democrats and the Army to reorganize the government. That is the time when Napoleon Duarte was made President. In addition, there was agreement, between the Army and the Christian Democrats that Colonel Adolfo Majano would be dismissed from his position on the junta immediately and that Colonel Moran would be relieved of his position as commander of the Treasury police in February 1981. Colonel Majano, the leader of the progressive forces, was dismissed and now resides in Mexico. Colonel Moran is still in charge of the Treasury police and this year he was promoted to full Colonel.

The Treasury Police under Colonel Moran's leadership has been called by U.S. State Department officials the Gestapo of El Salvador. On April 7, 1981, 23 people were killed by the Treasury police in an incident in Soyapango which closely resembled the operation in San Antonio Abad. In sum, Colonel Majano, the democrat, was purged and Colonel Moran, a notorious killer was promoted.

When we met with Colonel Moran, we reminded him of that earlier agreement that he would resign. Neither he nor his colleagues responded.

Colonel Majano subsequently visited me in Washington. He told me that forty of the sixty officers dismissed at the time of the coup for corruption or human rights violations have subsequently been restored to active duty.

What I concluded from our interviews with the Salvadoran high command are two major findings. First, the military high command is implicated directly in covering up the deaths of many Salvadoran citizens. By inference, we can conclude that it has also engaged in a cover-up of the tens of thousands of other Salvadorans who, according to Church sources, have been killed by Army or Security forces. Second, I believe that the Reagan Administration in its first year in office has been totally unable to exercise effective diplomacy to convince the Army to change its methods of operations. Let me add as an aside that I have full confidence that our Ambassador Dean Hinton is making every effort to communicate in the strongest terms our human rights concern. It is my perception, however, that he receives much less than total backing from the Administration and that he lacks the instruments to back up his representations to the Salvadoran military.

PRESIDENT DUARTE

We spent over six hours meeting with President Duarte. I first met Napoleon Duarte in 1977 in Washington at a time when he was still in exile in Venezuela. I find him a very engaging man, fully committed to human rights and democracy, and very sensitive to the needs of his people. It was President Duarte who told us with some shame that not one person had been convicted of murder in El Salvador for three years.

President Duarte told us a number of things I believe I should report to you. First, he said he has obtained agreement from the Army to seek a political solution. By a political solution, he means the elections scheduled for March 28. He said political solution based on negotiations would necessarily lead to negotiations between the Army and the guerrillas in which the Christian Democrats would be excluded. He said such negotiations would be surrender.

He also suggested, and here I am reading between the lines, that this assessment might change after the elections. But he refused in the middle of an election campaign to comment on what a new government's attitude toward negotiations might be after the elections. He reiterated his call to the guerrillas and their democratic allies to put away "pretenses of power," lay down their guns, and let the people decide in elections.

We asked him about the repeated massacres, the indiscriminate killings, the failure of the Army to take prisoners and the Army's unwillingness to punish in any substantial way military personnel who commit human rights abuses. He admitted that all these charges were true. He went on to argue that this has been true for fifty years; but that now the civilians in authority plus the military high command are committed to controlling "abuses of authority". He said they need time and less public attention focused on continuing abuses. This constant attention, he argued, only causes the military to become resistant to civilian efforts to press for reform.

We asked him if he would have greater ability to control the Army following elections. He responded that it would be a beginning, that legally for the first time, the civilians would have power. But it will still be a slow process.

On almost all the questions we raised on human rights, he urged us to take those questions to General Garcia.

My judgment is that President Duarte has not been able in any meaningful way to exercise greater control over the military. I also believe that he is wrong about the intentions of the high command.

I also firmly believe that without the presence of Napoleon Duarte, the level of killings would be much greater. If he were to fall, I believe that the ensuing military regime would attempt a quick victory and, toward that end, would engage in many more—and much wider scale—massacres than we see at present.

Ideally I believe that we should take Lopez Portillo up on his offer—it may be our last chance. We would have an international team, consisting of at least Sweden, France, West Germany, Venezuela, Costa Rica and Mexico, to call together the different factions to begin negotiations. The first step for this term would be to request a peacekeeping force of 5-10,000 from the U.N. to supervise a cease-fire and to stop the killings. The negotiations would lead to an agreed upon basis for national elections in

which all parties and individuals could participate. As I said, this would be the ideal way to proceed. That is not going to happen; the elections will take place. We must therefore hope that President Duarte and the Christian Democrats emerge from those elections with a commanding majority. And then with that majority, perhaps they can begin to make major reforms in the military and open up a dialogue with the armed opposition.

THE CHURCH

We spoke with Bishop Rivera y Damas, the Apostolic Administrator in San Salvador and to one of his chief aides. It is true that the Bishop said he favored U.S. military aid in that he does not favor a unilateral suspension of military aid by just one outside power. He also said he supports the elections, but cautioned that this was the least appropriate time possible for elections. There are many Salvadorans who have fled the country and will not be able to vote. In addition, elections will not be possible in contested areas. But since they are scheduled, he does support them as a partial indication of the feelings of the Salvadoran people. His aide said elections are just one note in the song of democracy. The people fear the left, the Army and the extreme right. The majority of abuses, however, come from the Army and right wing sources. His aide elaborated: The Army kills people who do not agree with the government—priests, union members, teachers, lawyers, and just anyone they suspect might be or become an enemy. The guerrillas kill primarily people they suspect of being "stool pigeons"; but that they often kill too quickly and without evidence. He also said that we do not want to replace the tyranny of the Army with a totalitarian system.

The Church in El Salvador looks to the United States. The Bishop's aide stated that he sees no present organized political force in El Salvador that will create a society better than the one they have known. They both therefore argue strongly that the United States should support dialogue and negotiations between the guerrillas and the government. They hope these negotiations would create a process through which other forces, more democratic and more committed to social justice, could emerge. The Bishop's aide argued that the Congress could make a major contribution to this effort by attaching even stronger conditions to military aid which goes to the Salvadoran Army.

CONCLUSIONS

Our visit has convinced me that the U.S. Government should not continue to supply military aid to El Salvador. I do not believe that military supplies from other nations at this time are significant. It is clear that the international arms merchants are channeling military supplies to at least the guerrillas and the right wing, if not also the Salvadoran Army.

The Army in my judgment is not in the present context reformable. It is an institution held together by corruption and it has maintained its power through terror. Neither President Duarte nor the Reagan Administration at this point has been able to convince it to change its ways.

The best hope I see is through negotiations. Negotiations, which is a political process, can strengthen the hand of democratic forces among the government and the left opposition forces. The negotiation process can also provide a forum to discuss ways to curb the violent extremes in both the Salvadoran Army and the guerrilla forces.

Finally, I should state my belief that without a negotiated settlement, the guerrillas will eventually win a military victory. Every objective observer we spoke to—and in this case I include the State Department—concluded that the war is not going well for the Salvadoran Army. If the guerrillas do win through force of arms after a period in which the United States has steadfastly supported the Salvadoran Army, we will then face a government extremely hostile to the United States.

To date, the Reagan Administration has equated negotiations with surrender. I believe that if we do not pursue negotiations, the Reagan Administration will be jeopardizing U.S. interests and risking a Vietnam-type involvement. It is time for the Reagan Administration to come back to reality. ●

BLACK COLLEGES

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to speak to you about the special difficulties that America's black colleges face today.

Black higher education institutions have been a part of education in the United States for 145 years. Those years have not been easy ones. Perennially financially strapped, these schools have had to compete with every other college and university for the black students they enroll. The difficulty of that task is evident; enrollment at the 100 or so such institutions in the United States has struck its lowest point since 1944. Of those matriculated students, most come from families whose incomes have traditionally been lower than their white counterparts. Also, until recently many States had often ignored their black colleges when it came time to distribute funds from the public coffers. Consequently, the money available for faculty salaries, resources, and facilities at black schools are generally lower than those of most mainstream schools. Yet they survive.

Now these schools face a new test. The administration's proposed budget cuts in student financial assistance will strike a particularly devastating blow to black colleges. A full 100 percent of the students at these schools depend upon some form of Federal financial aid. Last year, when Pell grants were reduced by \$80 a month, enrollment at black colleges fell 4 percent. Those percentages are certain to climb much higher next year if the administration budget is approved.

These colleges not only must endure; they must thrive as well. The black college offers opportunities and assistance that are available nowhere else to the young black. Students at these schools say they learn and appreciate more about themselves and their heritage as they study alongside their

peers of the same race. I know, I am a product of a black college, Texas State University in Houston. For me, and for all Americans, the importance of the following Wall Street Journal article about the state of the black college is evident. I urge you to read it.

The article follows:

BLACK COLLEGES UNDERGO THEIR STIFFEST TEST EVER AS STUDENT AID IS CUT

EFFECT OF INTEGRATION STEPS, COMPETITION FOR STUDENTS ALSO WORK AGAINST THEM

(By Frederick C. Klein)

Enrollment at Stillman College, a historically black, private liberal-arts school in Tuscaloosa, Ala., has dwindled to about 550 from more than 800 in the last five years, and Cordell Wynn, its president, is worried about its survival.

"They say that when the economy sneezes, black people catch cold," says the soft-spoken educator. "Well, the economy has a cold, and we've got pneumonia. Put that together with the student-aid cuts they're talking about and the competition for students we're in, and I have a hard time foreseeing a favorable outcome."

Views similar to Mr. Wynn's are being expressed at many of the 100 or so historically black institutions of higher education throughout the U.S. The conclusions aren't identical; black colleges aren't a monolith, and the large majority of them aren't in any immediate danger of failing. Indeed, resilience has been their trademark for histories as long as 145 years.

Nonetheless, economic, political and educational pressures have put black colleges on the spot as never before. For small, private ones like Stillman, most of which have Protestant-church roots, the overriding issue is money. Perennially strapped for funds and with up to 100% of their students dependent on federal tuition aid, they see potential disaster even in cuts far smaller than those proposed in the Reagan administration's fiscal 1983 budget.

A POSTWAR LOW

"Our schools are in their worst period since we were formed in 1944," declares Christopher F. Edley, the executive director of the United Negro College Fund, a fund-raising arm for 41 black private institutions.

For the 40-odd publicly supported black colleges—all but a few of which are in the South—the danger comes from an unexpected source: recent state agreements to end their racially separate college systems. The agreements, stemming from the so-called Adams Case litigation begun in 1970, call for financing predominantly black and predominantly white public colleges more equitably and the "enhancement" of black colleges' programs to strengthen them and attract more whites. But luring white students has proved difficult, and black educators in a number of states see proposals to merge their colleges with predominantly white ones as threats to their existence.

"It's curious that some of the same politicians who thought there was plenty of money to operate segregated colleges in the old days say we can't afford them now," says Charles U. Smith, the director of graduate studies at Florida A&M University, a state-supported school in Tallahassee. "When they say they want us merged, I think they really mean submerged."

INFERIORITY COMPLEX

Public or private, all of the black colleges face heightened competition for students

from white institutions, including ones that formerly excluded blacks. The University of South Carolina's student body, for example, now is 13 percent black; the University of Alabama's is 11 percent. In 1970, almost half of the nation's black students attended historically black colleges; this year the figure is about 17 percent.

All of the black colleges also share the pain of recurrent criticism that the institutions are hidebound and inferior. Many of such recent attacks have come from fellow blacks, making the criticism especially hard to bear. Writing in a 1979 issue of the *Nation* magazine, for instance, psychologist Kenneth B. Clark, a member of the New York Board of Regents, called the nation's dual-racial system of higher education "uneconomical and educationally unsound."

He added: "Black colleges perpetuate inferior academic standards for black students and award Jim Crow degrees that do not meet the standards of the average traditionally white colleges. . . . The existence of (racially separate) schools is a residue of past racism and a major factor in the perpetuation of present and future racism."

INCOME GAP

Black-college officials typically respond by citing long lists of noted graduates of their institutions and by asserting that they continue to fill an educational need that predominantly white schools don't. "We succeed with young blacks for the same reason women's colleges have consistently produced outstanding women: We respect our students intellectually and as people," says Benjamin F. Payton, the president of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama.

He believes that comparisons with "so-called average white schools" are inappropriate "because most of our students are poor and our schools have been stunted by white society. Given that, it's remarkable we've done as well as we have."

Observers say that black colleges' biggest problem—and the greatest threat to their existence—comes from the continuing gap between black and white family incomes. The most comprehensive statistics on the economic status of black students come from the private-school United Negro College Fund, but the data apply to students at black public colleges as well. They showed that in 1980, the median family income of prospective freshmen at fund-related schools was \$11,100, compared with \$22,200 for students nationally. The average annual parental contribution to freshmen's education at the 41 fund schools was \$870, sharply below the \$2,320 for all students. The median parental contribution was zero, indicating most freshmen received no parental aid.

Lacking much help from home, most black students must delicately piece together their college support from a variety of sources; one missing piece can topple the whole structure. Last year, an \$80-a-student reduction in Pell grants, the government's primary student-aid vehicle, was accompanied by a 4 percent drop in Negro-fund members' enrollments. Almost three-quarters of all black students get Pell grants, whose maximum is \$1,670.

Cuts proposed in the 1983 federal budget would go well beyond that. Pell grants would be cut further. "Supplemental" tuition grants that about one-third of black students receive would be abolished. The college work-study program that finances part-time campus jobs (including jobs for nearly half of black-college students) would be cut by about 25 percent from current

levels. Fees and interest rates on student loans would be raised sharply.

Private black colleges would be hit hardest because they are the furthest behind to begin with. Their endowments average some \$3,000 per student, about half the national level. The Reagan administration has pledged to help black colleges raise more money privately, but black schools' efforts there traditionally have been hindered by the incomes and positions of their graduates.

At some small black schools, a result already has been substandard facilities and the kind of penny-pinching unknown at other institutions. Philander Smith College in Little Rock, Ark., hit with a 200-student enrollment drop over the last five years to 637, has eliminated all classes with fewer than seven students, cut back on the remedial courses that many freshmen take, closed the student bookstore, increased teaching loads and doubled up on administrators' tasks; the dean of students, for example, also runs the intramural sports program.

*** Ronald Atkinson, a 37-year-old Ph.D., earns about \$15,000 a year for teaching math and computer sciences at Stillman College. He makes ends meet by teaching nights at a local junior college and playing the organ at his church. "I like teaching, but the money pinch is driving me out," he says. "It's discouraging to see public-high-school teachers with master's degrees here earning more than I do."

On top of the financial problems are less-well-defined issues related to the makeup of historically black colleges. With more of the brighter black youngsters going to traditionally white institutions, many black colleges find that the quality of their students is declining, at least statistically. Even at Howard University in Washington, whose 17 colleges and professional schools make it the most comprehensive of the black universities, incoming freshmen score almost 100 points below national averages in standard reading and math tests. The upshot is that many black schools must invest more of their hard-won resources in programs of remedial instruction.

The atmosphere at many black schools is a good deal more conservative than at many of their white counterparts. Faculty members who have taught at both kinds of institutions say their black-college students, especially ones from small-town or "ghetto" backgrounds, are less than eager to challenge their instructors' intellectual authority or their schools' often-strict rules for student behavior. Coed dorms are virtually unknown at black colleges; curfews and no-drinking rules are common.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Alumni groups are powerful forces resisting change, contributing to the failure of moves to merge small and struggling black colleges in the same geographical areas. They also fight more-minor alterations. James E. Cheek, the president of Howard University, recalls that when he headed much smaller Shaw University in Raleigh, N.C., he recommended changing its name to Shaw College to better reflect its status. "It would have been easier to dig up a cemetery," he says. "Some alumni opposed it because words in the school song wouldn't rhyme."

Black-college administrators are frequently faulted for their reluctance to delegate authority ("a lot of us dribble better than we pass," quips one). And administrators at publicly supported black colleges are often

faulted for their perceived failure to represent their institutions more effectively to white-dominated legislatures.

At Morgan State University in Baltimore, the faculty senate in 1980 voted to oust President Andrew Billingsley Jr. for, among other things, not obtaining needed educational programs for the school and alleged spending funds ticketed for books and instruction on administrative projects. But Maryland's college governing board voted to retain Mr. Billingsley. He wouldn't comment on the charges; a Morgan State spokesman says the disputes over funds stem from the "financial plight of the whole university. There wasn't enough to go around, period."

Indeed, a pattern of state neglect is at the root of the frustrations of the public colleges that enroll some 70 percent of the estimated 220,000 students in historically black schools. This has been remedied in part by states' equal-financing pledges in the Adams Case settlements, but none of the 10 states involved in the litigation has pledged "reparations" to make up for past inequities.

Moreover, grievances continue to mount over the placement of important facilities. North Carolina, for instance, pledged under an Adams Case consent decree to upgrade its black colleges, but its most coveted new school, a college of veterinary medicine, was awarded, after a heated battle to white North Carolina State University instead of black North Carolina A&T.

And while Adams-related movers have brought needed funds to black public colleges, they have failed to lure appreciable numbers of white students, whose presence is valued as a symbol of broader community acceptance.

The most dramatic example of this has come at historically black Tennessee State University in Nashville, which in 1979 was merged by court order with the University of Tennessee's newer, predominantly white Nashville branch campus. At the time of the merger, each school had about 5,000 students, and a racial mixture of roughly 50-50 was seen for the surviving institution, which carries the Tennessee State name. But white transfers and dropouts have cut current enrollment to about 7,700 students—two-thirds of them black—and the school's last three freshman classes have had black proportions of 70 percent, 86 percent and 93 percent.

"We've spent a lot of time trying to sell ourselves to the people of Nashville, but so far we don't have much to show for it," a Tennessee State spokesman says.

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

Black colleges have made greater headway with cooperative efforts with other universities—white as well as black—that expand their resources and offerings. Four black colleges (Clark, Morehouse, Morris Brown and Spelman) and three graduate schools share facilities and faculty in the Atlanta University Center. A sizable number of black colleges have dual-degree engineering programs with larger nearby universities. Students at Florida A&M and predominantly white Florida State University, both in Tallahassee, can take a wide variety of classes at each other's campuses.

Black college administrators, however, make it clear that achieving racial integration is secondary to their goal of educating young blacks. "Race is too pervasive an issue in American society to pretend that educational institutions can be blind to it," asserts Tuskegee's Mr. Payton. "We want

blacks to have a choice of where and with whom they will go to college, just like Catholics and women do."

In fact, many black students continue to find in historically black colleges an environment conducive to growth in many areas. Charles Rutland was an honor student in high school near Macon, Ga., and was accepted to Stanford, Vanderbilt and Georgia Tech, but he chose Florida A&M. "There's a warmth here I didn't detect at those other places when I visited," says the business-school senior. "I've learned things about myself I don't think I could have learned at a white school."

Alex Parish, a graduate at Howard University and Harvard Law School, says, "Going to a black school gave me the opportunity to be in the majority for a change. I went to integrated high schools in Memphis, and I never knew if I achieved things because of, or despite, being black. When everyone's black, you know you succeed or fail on your own."●

THE OTA "ACID RAIN STUDY"— ANOTHER "SMOKING GUN"

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Environment Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee here in the House have been debating the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act for over a year. A great deal of this debate has been devoted to a discussion of the acid rain issue. Acid rain, as all Members know, is a shorthand description for a terribly damaging environmental occurrence.

"Normal" precipitation, in equilibrium with carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, has a pH of 5.6. This is contrasted with a "neutral" pH; that is, level of acidity of 7.0. The acidity in precipitation is principally due to sulfuric and nitric acids which come, primarily, from manmade sources. Although the issue of acid rain is new to us as policymakers, the investigations of this phenomenon have been underway for over a century. Under the provisions of the British Alkali Act of 1863, a scientist named Angus Smith discovered that precipitation with high nitric and sulfuric acid content was caused by the combustion of coal. Research has proceeded since this key discovery.

Through additional investigations more is now known about acid rain. For example:

The National Academy of Sciences reported last year, "There is little probability that some factor other than emissions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides is responsible for acid rain."

There is immense regional damage caused by this phenomenon: In Mississippi the loblolly pine has had its growth retarded dramatically by acid rain; in Minnesota, 2,600 lakes, in a

study reported by Glass (1980), were cited as "in jeopardy"; in Massachusetts, 1.1 trillion gallons of drinking water have been acid impacted; in New York, 11,000 acres of lakes have reached the critical stage of acidification.

The DOE "JASONS" study indicates that, without reductions in sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide, average annual rainfall in the Eastern United States will reach a dangerously low level of alkalinity: a pH of 4.0. At this level, fish cannot survive and long-standing damage to soils and aquatic ecosystems will result.

Estimates compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and by the National Commission on Air Quality indicate that crops are damaged at a rate of \$1.8 billion annually because of excessive acid rain precursors—the emissions of SO₂ and NO_x which lead to acidity in precipitation.

Despite findings like these and an ever-growing body of scientific research, the administration has declined to back any legislation to control acid rain. Their oft-heard refrain is that more research is needed. But as the scientific research accumulates and accumulates, we must ask, When will enough be enough? As we wait for the last scintilla of evidence, the damage from acid rain continues. And believe me, the evidence is growing.

On Thursday, March 25, 1982, I released a report by an OTA contractor titled "Regional Assessment of Aquatic Resources at Risk From Acidic Deposition." This study represents yet another smoking gun, more documented scientific evidence that acid rain is growing, looming environmental tragedy. The administration's proposal on Clean Air, H.R. 5252, does nothing to control acid rain. In fact, it will make it much worse. The bill, which is now before the full Energy and Commerce Committee, loosens controls on tall stacks, weakens technology requirements for powerplants, will quintuple the number of pollution violations in the national parks, and will double tailpipe emissions of nitrogen oxides, an identified bad actor in the acid rain drama.

I submit my analysis of this important report to be reprinted in the RECORD at this point. I will be delighted to make the full text of the report available to my colleagues at their request.

THE DAMAGE IS DOCUMENTED AGAIN

WASHINGTON.—Connecticut Representative TOBY MOFFETT today released a new study on acid rain documenting severe and widespread damage to water and soil resources throughout the Eastern United States.

"This report states that 3,000 lakes and 25,000 miles of streams in a 31-State region in the Eastern United States have been damaged in dramatic proportions by acid rain," Moffett explained. "These findings again implicate sulfur dioxide pollution as

the main culprit for environmental damage from acid rain."

The study was performed for the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) by the Institute of Ecology in Indianapolis, Ind. The study analyzed the impacts from acid rain to soils and aquatic resources in 14 regions in the Eastern United States.

"The findings in this study," said Representative Moffett, "are devastating. In region 1, an area including the Adirondacks, Western New York, and Pennsylvania, the levels of acidity in the waters have increased to 4.8 pH in years 1930-75; these are fish-killing levels of acidity," the Congressman noted. "In region 2, which includes my own State of Connecticut, Maine and western New England, more than 1,200 lakes are designated 'acid sensitive'; 11,000 miles of streams are 'acid altered.' It's a potential ecological disaster."

Recent studies by experts at the National Academy of Sciences and OTA have implicated sulfur dioxide pollution from Midwestern powerplants as the principal cause of the acid rain problem. These emissions come from tall smoke stacks built at these plants in the early seventies. The pollutants are transported in the atmosphere and deposited at great distances from the plants in dry or wet forms.

"What is particularly alarming about the findings of this study," asserted Moffett, "is where the damage is not occurring. The soils analysis, for example, which was performed for OTA shows no sensitive lands in Ohio. This is incredible when you consider that this is the State from which these damaging pollutants originate."

Moffett also criticized yesterday's subcommittee passage of the administration-backed proposal to rewrite the Clean Air Act of 1977, authored by Representative Thomas Luken (D.-Ohio). The Luken Proposal which was passed by the Subcommittee on Health and Environment Wednesday, March 24, 1982, in Moffett's words, "will make this problem all the more severe."

"You could call this bill 'the Acid Precipitation Production Act,'" Moffett asserted. "By deregulating tall stacks, by repealing tight restrictions on sulfur dioxide emitting industrial boilers, by weakening technology control requirements on powerplants, smelters and the like, we have guaranteed more acid rain when the evidence shows that more controls are needed."

During the subcommittee's deliberations, Moffett's proposal to control sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions was defeated on a 13 to 7 vote.

"The debate on my amendment, fueled by flimsy data provided by the utility industry, suggested that the evidence was insufficient to begin a control program," Moffett said. "But they cannot continue to ignore this kind of study which shows that acid rain is killing lakes and leading to an environmental tragedy. We must begin controls now."

A similar legislative proposal to Moffett's has been introduced in the Senate by George Mitchell (D.-Maine).●

WORLD FOOD DAY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, last October 16, we joined many other nations in celebrating World Food Day. In cities across this country and throughout the world activities were held to address the concerns we all have about continued starvation and malnutrition and the very major policy questions we will face in the years ahead as agricultural resources dwindle while the demand for them increases.

Last year, my colleague BEN GILMAN and I were able to pass with the assistance of this body a resolution proclaiming October 16 World Food Day. Again, this year we have introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 430, calling on the President to proclaim October 16, 1982 as World Food Day, and I am sure we will meet with equal success here in Congress and with the administration.

I know in my own district in southern Illinois celebration of World Food Day provided good public education and brought many people into activities focused on increasing public awareness of the problems we have in this country as well as elsewhere in the international community. I urge my colleagues to join us in sponsoring this resolution and hope we will see its passage within the next few months. Over the past several years several esteemed groups have laid out in simple and dramatic terms the problems we will be facing in the decades ahead as prices continue to skyrocket, resources lessen, land becomes more scarce and the world population continues to grow. Today, more than 500 million people suffer from severe hunger and malnutrition with millions dying each year—many of them children. We must stop this senseless despair and proclaiming a time, each year, when many people turn their thoughts to these problems is one very necessary and valuable activity. It will not solve the problems but it will help raise the issues in a constructive manner and foster greater cooperation—here and abroad.●

REVISED TMI-2 CLEANUP
LEGISLATION

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced legislation, H.R. 5963, which revises and streamlines a bill I introduced last year to

assist in funding the cleanup of Three Mile Island Unit 2, and to require sufficient insurance to take care of any future accidents.

Recently I made yet another trip to Three Mile Island to describe these revisions to last year's bill, H.R. 2512. What should have been a normal news conference turned into a vivid demonstration of the need for this bill. Five minutes before the news conference was to begin, the warning sirens at the crippled reactor again sounded. This time the reactor was leaking still more radioactive water in what is known in nuclear accident jargon as an "unusual event." At TMI-2 the unusual event is usual.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5963 addresses the serious public health and safety hazards that still remain at TMI-2 today. It also recognizes that another accident can occur at some other reactor tomorrow, and if that happens, that utility will be no more able to cleanup its radioactive swamp than the TMI utility is. These are serious problems which can no longer be ignored.

I am including here a section-by-section analysis of this new bill, as well as a discussion paper of the need for and the implications of the legislation. Congressman UDALL, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will be holding hearings on these problems on April 5 and 6. His attention to this issue is very much appreciated. Hopefully, we will not have to be facing these problems on the fourth anniversary of the accident.

REVISIONS TO H.R. 2512

These revisions to H.R. 2512 maintain the policy goals of that legislation, but streamline the implementation of those goals. These modifications are based upon a changed environment from that which existed at the time H.R. 2512 was originally introduced.

INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

Under the revised bill the requirement remains that all nuclear utilities obtain and maintain on-site property damage insurance sufficient to protect public health and safety following any future accident. The revised bill requires a minimum of \$1.5 billion in insurance. However, procedural steps for obtaining this insurance have been improved. Under these revisions, the Federal Government neither offers nor administers the additional insurance which is required of the industry. In addition, the timing of the insurance requirement is structured so that nuclear utilities must obtain the maximum amount of on-site property damage insurance which the NRC determines to be available up until 1985. At that time, nuclear utilities are required to have and maintain \$1.5 billion in insurance, which the NRC can subsequently raise if more insurance is necessary.

Like H.R. 2512, under the revised bill, the holding of this insurance is a condition for a nuclear utility to obtain or retain an operating license. Given the time provided under these revisions, the insurance and utility industries should be able to put in place the necessary \$1.5 billion in coverage.

In testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the nuclear insurance industry stated that they could provide adequate coverage if they were given sufficient time. EEI has also testified that the insurance needs of the industry can be met if the industry is given enough time. These revisions give both industries adequate time to put this insurance in place, and helps define what is a sufficient level of insurance—\$1.5 billion.

TMI-2 CLEANUP ASSISTANCE

Rather than collecting nuclear utility industry contributions for the TMI-2 cleanup through a retroactive insurance provision, as was done in H.R. 2512, the revised bill simplifies the obtaining of these funds by creating straight assessment on nuclear utilities for TMI-2 cleanup contributions. These contributions are required for a utility to obtain or retain an operating license for a nuclear reactor.

Under H.R. 2512, a formula for industry contributions was established in which 75 percent of the uninsured cleanup costs at TMI-2 would initially be provided for by the nuclear utility industry. One-half of that amount would be in the form of a grant and one-half would be in the form of a loan which General Public Utilities Corporation would repay over an extended period of time beginning upon the completion of the TMI-2 cleanup. The intent of this approach was obvious, it would allow those costs of the cleanup which might ultimately be borne by Pennsylvania ratepayers to be spread over a longer period of time so as to minimize their economic burden.

Unfortunately, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission has decided to remove this option. The PaPUC has ruled that GPU's portion of the cleanup costs will be borne by its ratepayers on a pay-as-you-go basis. This will create the precise financial burden on the ratepayers that I had hoped to avoid. To make matters worse, the Governor has now endorsed this PaPUC action of raising electric rates to GPU customers.

The effect of this cruel and misguided PaPUC action has been to effectively eliminate the need for the nuclear utility industry loan portion of H.R. 2512. Consequently, the revised bill drops that section of H.R. 2512 and retains only the nuclear utility industry grant.

Last Fall the General Accounting Office completed its work on estimating the costs of the TMI-2 cleanup. GAO concluded that the uninsured TMI-2 cleanup costs equal about \$600 million. Taking this number and using the formula under H.R. 2512, the nuclear utility industry would have provided \$450 toward the cleanup. Of this, \$225 would be in the form of a grant and \$225 would be in the form of a loan. Since the ratepayers are now going to have to pay what would have been the GPU loan portion of H.R. 2512, this has been dropped. Therefore, the revised bill calls only for a nuclear utility industry grant of \$225 million toward the TMI-2 cleanup, or \$37.5 million per year.

ASSESSMENT FORMULA

These revisions continue the policy under H.R. 2512 that only nuclear utilities should be required by law to make TMI-2 cleanup contributions. Under these revisions, half of the required annual contribution of \$37.5 million will be based on the design megawatt ratings of nuclear plants in operation and under construction. Each nuclear utility would be assessed a pro rata share of this \$18.75 million. The other \$18.75 million as-

assessment will be based on the combined total sales of electricity in a given year of the nuclear utilities, with each individual nuclear utility responsible for its pro rata share.

The revised bill also clarifies an important point regarding these assessments—each state's own public utility commission shall

make its own decision on how to allocate the assessments. If a state utility commission wants to force the utility and its stockholders to absorb these assessments, and spare its ratepayers, that is the utility commission's prerogative.

The following Table shows what the annual cost of this revised legislation would

have been to nuclear utilities had this formula been in place in 1980. Also shown is the equivalent of these assessments in the rates of a residential customer using 500 KWHs if that utility's public utility commission made the decision to pass the entire assessment through to the utility's ratepayers.

COST OF NEW BILL TO UTILITIES

Utility name	Megawatts electrical (MWe)	Sales GWH's	MWe charge (\$1,000)	Sales charge (\$1,000)	Total charge (\$1,000)	500 kWh charge (cents)
Alabama Power Co.	1,720	31,117	244	431	675	1.1
Arizona Public Service	3,810	10,912	511	130	641	3.0
Arkansas Power & Light	1,694	17,574	240	244	484	1.4
Baltimore Gas & Electric	1,700	16,170	242	225	467	1.4
Boston Edison	670	11,627	96	161	257	1.1
Carolina Power & Light	4,045	27,993	574	388	962	1.7
Cincinnati Gas & Light	810	11,804	114	163	277	1.2
Cleveland Electric Illuminating	2,410	18,364	341	255	596	1.6
Commonwealth Edison	12,089	64,040	1,714	887	2,601	2.0
Connecticut Yankee	575	2,941	81	41	122	2.1
Consolidated Edison	873	29,242	124	405	529	.9
Consumers Power	2,413	25,359	343	351	694	1.4
Dairyland	50	4,018	8	56	64	.8
Detroit Edison	1,100	37,148	156	516	672	.9
Duke Power	8,510	49,938	1,208	692	1,900	1.9
Duquesne Light	1,666	12,649	236	176	412	1.6
Florida Power	825	17,046	116	236	352	1.0
Florida Power & Light	2,886	40,602	409	563	972	1.2
General Public Utilities Corp.	1,412	20,356	201	283	484	1.2
Georgia Power Co.	3,772	44,145	534	611	1,145	1.3
Gulf States	940	28,891	133	401	534	.9
Houston Lighting & Power	2,500	50,275	190	660	850	.8
Illinois Power	950	13,574	135	188	323	1.2
Indiana-Michigan Electric Co.	2,148	20,843	304	289	593	1.4
Iowa Electric Light & Power	545	3,861	77	54	131	1.7
Long Island Lighting Co.	820	13,288	116	184	300	1.1
Louisiana Power & Light	1,165	22,711	165	315	480	1.1
Maine Yankee	790	4,404	113	62	175	2.0
Mississippi Power & Light	2,500	12,832	354	178	532	2.1
Nebraska Public Power District	778	7,314	111	101	212	1.4
Niagara Mohawk	1,690	31,547	240	434	674	1.1
Northeast Utilities	2,672	19,565	379	272	651	1.7
Northern States Power	1,576	20,032	223	278	501	1.3
Omaha Public Power District	490	6,592	69	92	161	1.2
Pacific Gas & Electric	2,253	61,839	319	857	1,176	.9
Pennsylvania Power & Light	2,100	21,844	298	304	602	1.4
Philadelphia Electric	4,240	27,394	602	381	983	1.8
Portland General Electric	1,130	13,305	159	184	343	1.3
Power Authority State of New York	1,786	33,073	253	459	712	1.1
Public Service Electric & Gas	4,345	29,341	617	407	1,024	1.7
Public Service of Colorado	330	13,417	47	186	233	.9
Public Service of Indiana	2,260	17,370	321	240	561	1.6
Public Service of New Hampshire	2,300	5,383	326	75	401	3.7
Public Service of Oklahoma	2,300	15,423	310	190	500	1.6
Rochester Gas & Electric	490	6,548	69	90	159	1.2
Sacramento Municipal Utility District	913	7,064	129	98	227	1.6
South Carolina Electric & Gas	900	11,620	174	157	331	1.2
Southern California Edison	2,636	57,025	373	791	1,164	1.0
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,261	116,211	2,174	1,611	3,785	1.6
Texas Utilities	2,300	55,003	326	763	1,089	1.0
Toledo Edison	906	7,685	129	107	236	1.5
Union Electric	1,150	23,574	163	326	489	1.0
Vermont Yankee	514	2,979	73	41	114	1.9
Virginia Electric & Power	4,157	37,067	589	514	1,103	1.5
Wisconsin Electric Power	994	17,469	141	242	383	1.1
Wisconsin Public Service	535	6,124	75	84	159	1.3
Yankee Atomic	175	291	24	4	28	4.8

It is clear from this table that should public utility commissions choose to pass these costs onto ratepayers [which they are not required to do], it would not represent a significant new financial burden. The additional cost to a 500 kWh customer would range between 0.8¢ to 4.8¢, with the average additional cost equalling less than 1.5¢.

These revisions require more from nuclear utilities than EEI has recommended to its membership—\$225 million versus \$192 million, or \$37.5 million/year versus \$32 million/year. However, it is hard to see how the utility industry could take the position that \$192 million is in its best interests while \$225 million is not.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title—Nuclear Powerplant Decontamination Act of 1982.

Section 2. Findings—(1) TMI-2 represents a potential health and safety hazard; (2) the cleanup of TMI-2 will remove this hazard; (3) GPU does not have sufficient funds to

pay for the cleanup; (4) adequate on-site property damage insurance is necessary to protect public health and safety in the event of future nuclear powerplant accidents; and (5) public and investor confidence has been adversely affected by TMI-2 and the underinsured nature of the nuclear utility industry.

Section 3. Purposes—(1) to require nuclear utilities to maintain sufficient on-site property damage insurance to protect public health and safety by permitting a timely cleanup following any future nuclear powerplant accident; and (2) to establish an equitable national program to distribute a portion of the TMI-2 cleanup costs among nuclear utilities.

Section 4. Definitions—Defines the terms: (1) On-site property damage; (2) On-site property damage insurance; (3) Commission; and (4) Licensee.

Section 5. Future Decontamination Insurance Requirement—(a)(1) Requires nuclear powerplant licensees to obtain the maxi-

mum amount of on-site property damage insurance determined to be available by the NRC until December 31, 1984. (a)(2) Requires that beginning on January 1, 1985, nuclear powerplant licensees must have no less than \$1.5 billion in on-site property damage insurance. (b) Directs the NRC to periodically review the adequacy of on-site property damage insurance to protect public health and safety and to set higher minimum requirements if they are necessary.

Section 6. Present Decontamination Requirement—(a) During the period beginning January 1, 1983, and ending December 31, 1988, requires all nuclear powerplant licensees to be annually assessed funds so that the aggregate annual assessment equals \$37.5 million. These assessments are to be based upon a formula which: (1) collects an aggregate amount of \$18.75 million in pro rata shares based on total sales of electricity by all licensees in the year of the assessment; and (2) collects an aggregate amount

of \$18.75 million in pro rata shares based on the design megawatt rating of the nuclear powerplants in operation or under construction. These funds shall be made available to assist in the TMI-2 cleanup.

(b) The NRC shall terminate or suspend the license of any licensee which fails to make its required payment within 90 days of the receipt of an assessment.

(c) States that nothing in this Act shall detract from the rights of state utility commissions to allocate the payments required under the Act between the utility, its stockholders, or its ratepayers as the commissions deem appropriate.

(d) Assessments collected under subsection (a) shall be placed in a trust fund whose sole purpose is limited to funding the TMI-2 cleanup. Payments from the trust fund will be made within 60 days after receipt of notice that eligible cleanup costs have been incurred. The trust fund will be audited annually and that audit shall be submitted to the NRC.

(e) Provides for subrogation and indemnification rights, and the distribution of any funds received through the exercise of these rights. ●

BIG BUSINESS MOVING TO GET OFF THE BANDWAGON OF REAGANOMICS

HON. BOB SHAMANSKY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. SHAMANSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a Washington Post article (March 29, 1982) commenting on big business' gradual discontent with Reaganomics. [From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1982]

BIG BUSINESS MOVING TO GET OFF THE BANDWAGON OF REAGANOMICS

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Last spring the American business community was united as never before in praise of President Reagan's economic program. Typical of the captains of industry was Theodore F. Brophy, chief executive officer of the General Telephone & Electronics Corp. and a senior officer of the Business Roundtable.

"Implementation of the [Reagan administration's] proposed spending reductions, when combined with the other aspects of the president's economic recovery program," Brophy testified last May, "will provide us with a healthy, growing economy on a long-range basis—the best protection for all individuals."

Brophy's view prevailed, and Congress enacted Reagan's program. Last week, though, Brophy revised and extended his remarks:

"Our economy is in the throes of a recession," Brophy testified, "accompanied by inordinately high interest rates, and now is facing the prospect of large future budget deficits . . . The [Business] Roundtable is deeply concerned about the size of projected deficits and believes that, unless promptly dealt with, they will encourage continued high interest rates and slow economic recovery and growth."

Brophy was testifying for the Roundtable, which now favors stern action to reduce gaping federal deficits. One by one, the organizations that businessmen form to ad-

vance their interests are jumping off the bandwagon of Reaganomics. No matter that less than a year ago, the same business groups were pushing that bandwagon forward like a V8 in a 1960s' gas-guzzler.

"Corporate America didn't have any idea what was in the tax bill," observed Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.) last week, trying to explain the business community's flip-flop on Reaganomics. "They were like hounds after a fox," he added, referring to the big corporate tax breaks that made the Reagan program so attractive to businessmen.

A prominent Republican lobbyist who works for big business said he thought executives were now getting pressure from their boards of directors and stockholders to do something about high interest rates and the recession. "It just somehow isn't working," this man said of Reaganomics, adding that the business community is digging in to save the tax breaks it got from Congress last year. "I think they're getting a little greedy," he said, adding, "if you put my name in the paper, I'll be run out of town."

In a brief interview in the hallway outside the Senate Finance Committee, Brophy was asked why the tune had changed so quickly. "I don't think any of us feel we have crystal balls," he replied. Pressed on the wrong prognosis he and his colleagues gave Congress last spring, Brophy asked who had predicted that interest rates would still be so high.

One answer to that question is Henry Kaufman, managing director of Salomon Bros. Inc., an economist with a wide following on Wall Street. Kaufman was one of many voices warning last year that if the Reagan program were adopted, it would produce an unavoidable collision between an expansionary fiscal policy and a restrictive monetary policy. Brophy acknowledged that Kaufman was "right about some things, but not everything," noting that inflation fell much faster than Kaufman had said.

Another prediction of continued high interest rates came from the Business Council, a group of major corporations. At about the time Brophy was making his optimistic predictions last May, the council issued a formal forecast that echoed his hopefulness about economic growth, but said interest rates would stay in the 14-to-16 percent range throughout the year (as, roughly, they have). And the Business Council did predict much lower inflation.

But all that was last year, when corporate America was exhilarated by the defeat of a president it detested and the election of a free enterprise Republican.

"Businessmen are fundamentally Republicans," observed Irving Shapiro, the recently retired chief executive officer of DuPont, who himself was close to President Carter. "They persuaded themselves to back a new Republican administration 100 percent. They did that although they had misgivings."

"Their uneasiness spilled over when they saw the latest budget proposals" and the big deficits they contained, Shapiro said. His analysis seems to be supported by a recent poll of members of the Wall Street investment community conducted by the American Stock Exchange. Where 67 percent of those polled "strongly approved" the Reagan program a year ago, only 41 percent do so now.

"You see," explained Sen. Russell B. Long (La.), ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, "it's not working the way it was supposed to."

The captains of industry "are seeing what they never expected to see," added a prominent Wall Street economist—"a terribly weak economy combined with high interest rates. And the disinflation they see is largely at the expense of their profits."

"Businessmen have discovered that high interest rates are more painful than high taxes or high inflation," added a senior Republican aide in the Senate. "Now it's stark terror," he added, describing the dire private warnings that some businessmen are conveying to Senate Republican leaders who are hoping to persuade Reagan to modify his program to reduce future deficits.

None of these quotations come from sitting corporate executives. The captains of industry are active in private lobbying, but they appear unwilling to talk openly about their change of heart about Reaganomics. In preparing this article, calls were made to a number of chief executives who sent back word that they would be unavailable to be interviewed. Among them were Walter Wriston of New York's Citibank, C. C. Garvin of Exxon, and William Agee of Bendix.

One executive who was willing to be interviewed, J. Peter Grace, chief executive of W. R. Grace & Co., expressed great impatience with his fellow businessmen who are having second thoughts about Reaganomics. "It tells you that they're stupid, that's all, and they didn't know what they were doing in the first place," Grace said.

For his part, Grace is still staunchly in Reagan's corner. "I knew it was going to get worse before it got better," he said. Grace is now chairing the president's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control.

One way to find out what less enthusiastic business executives are thinking is to follow them around Capitol Hill. There one hears that the public statements of the Business Roundtable, the president of the American Stock Exchange, the American Bankers Association and others are relatively gentle expressions of feelings that are expressed much more starkly in private.

For example, officials of the Business Roundtable have passed the word that they have told the administration there will be "no more blind following" of White House policy. "We went along last year because we felt we had to" is the latest word from them.

Warren E. Buffett, an entrepreneur and newspaper proprietor who called himself a reluctant Carter supporter in 1980, said of Republican businessmen: "They really think it [the economic situation] is a sham, but they hate like hell to knock their guy [Reagan] in public."

Corporate America's change of heart and the ensuing demands to Congress to "do something" about federal deficits and interest rates has not been well received on Capitol Hill. Senior Senate Republicans have told many complaining businessmen to convey their new anxieties to the White House. At least one has told the businessmen to take their new message to members of Reagan's "kitchen cabinet," the informal group of California businessmen who have been close to Reagan for decades. The man making this suggestion says maybe his oldest friends can persuade the president that he must alter his policy.

"It was predictable that we were going to be in this position," said Rep. Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and one of the members who hears most often from the executives. "We were listening to the same econo-

mists they were," Rostenkowski said, referring to those like Kaufman who were skeptical about the Reagan program, but the businessmen "didn't want to believe" that things could turn out badly.

Suggestions that they might have foreseen the trouble do not sit well with businessmen and their lobbyists. For example, James D. (Mike) McKevitt, a former Republican congressman who is chief lobbyist for the National Federation of Independent Business in Washington, reacted angrily when asked why his group did not realize that the combination of big tax breaks and a much bigger defense budget would create big federal deficits.

Although McKevitt's group of small businessmen made total support for the Reagan program key test votes in their annual ranking of Congress last year, he denied that the group had supported either the big defense buildup or some of the big tax cuts.

John L. Sherman, an aide to the Democratic majority on Ways and Means, said he thought that "the CEOs are no smarter than the rest of us—they may be dumber." In the summer of 1980, he recalled, the then-chairman of Ways and Means, Rep. Al Ullman (D-Ore.), traveled around the country talking to chief executives about whether they wanted an across-the-board tax cut like the one Senate Republicans were then pushing.

Of 10 executives Ullman questioned, none was eager for such a tax cut, Sherman said. Then six months later nearly all the country's top executives were fervently supporting Reagan's similar idea. And now, nearly a year later, many have misgivings.

"I don't know why they got fooled," said a senior Senate Republican aide. "I think they thought Reagan had a magic answer, and they didn't analyze the fact that the magic answer would do something to them. They sure as hell are disappointed now," this Republican added.

THE IRS STRIKES—TRADING DOLLARS FOR PENNIES

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA) are the following news articles from the Austin American Statesman, March 19, 1982, and the New York Daily News, August 7, 1981.

Since the IRS admits it is not cost effective to chase pennies, and because they are obviously aware of the taxpayer's prerogative to round to the nearest dollar, the only possible motive for such action is blatant harassment.

This is yet another means used by the IRS to instill fear and remind the public of their awesome power.

IRS FLUSHES OUT EVERY LAST CENT

WEST FARMINGTON, OHIO (AP).—The IRS spared nothing to go after its man, Roy

Elza, who owed the Federal Government 18 cents.

The IRS spent \$3 to file an item with the Trumbull County recorder against Elza's property and spent another 20 cents to mail it.

Both IRS and the recorder's staff spent time processing the lien.

"It makes no difference. It's an unpaid Federal tax," said Rollie Woods, a spokesman for the Cleveland regional IRS office.

The lien indicates the late tax applies to Elza's withholding tax that was due in June 1979. All of Elza's assets are frozen until the bill is paid.

POUNDS OF FLESH—IRS FATTENS THIN DIME OWED

(By Bella English)

A dime won't even buy penny candy any more, but to Uncle Sam it can be worth a lot more than 10 cents.

The Government is demanding that a Chinatown woman pay a \$28.15 penalty because she underpaid her 1980 taxes—by a dime.

In an August 3, letter to Chan Wing, 59, the Internal Revenue Service said: "Unpaid tax on return is 10 cents. Penalty charge is \$28.15. Balance due to IRS is \$28.25. Make check payable to IRS."

Wing, who speaks no English, showed the form to her stepdaughter, Rose Wine, assistant manager at a Chemical Bank branch in Jackson Heights, Queens.

"It cost them more to print up this form and send this out than my stepmother owes," Rose said. "Do you believe this? I think this is the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard of. I just had to laugh."

Her laughter turned to anger yesterday when she went to the IRS office in Jackson Heights and was told that her stepmother must indeed pay the 10 cents and the \$28.15.

"I can't believe it," Rose said. "They're wasting your money and my money over a lousy dime. But I don't know which way to turn. If I have to pay it, I have to pay it."

Rose said, though, that she is considering writing a letter of appeal to President Reagan.

IRS officials said that disclosure laws prevent their discussing the case.●

A VERY REWARDING PROGRAM

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, it behooves us in these times which are so full of tension, mistrust, and even outright belligerence between the United States and many other countries in the world, to seek opportunities in which we can meet and work with people of other countries as fellow human beings and as friends. That is why I want to let you and our fellow colleagues know about a most satisfying program underway in my office. I have made a practice of opening my office to other countries as a home office for interns and fellows.

Today the second of these fellows, Mr. Juk-Chul Lee, who is a senior staff member of the Committee on Com-

merce and Industry in the Korean National Assembly, will complete a 6-month fellowship with us. His presence in our office has been a welcome event for my staff and for myself. We have had a unique opportunity to see ourselves and the United States in a new way. It has been an eye opening, sometimes humbling, but most assuredly, an invaluable experience. I believe, Mr. Lee has also profited by his time with us. He has come to know how our Congress works. But more importantly, we have come to know each other as friends. For us, Korea is no longer simply a country on the other side of the world. It is the home of our friend Mr. Lee. And I think Mr. Lee feels the same way about us.

We often give lip service to "understanding" in these Chambers and then proceed as though we lack understanding. I would submit to you that there is no better way to achieve mutual understanding with other people than to work beside them day after day in the same office. Now I know this observation is true whether my coworker be a citizen of Washington, D.C., or whether that coworker be a citizen of Seoul, Korea.

It is with a sense of sadness that the members of my staff and I bid farewell to Mr. Lee. At the same time, we feel a sense of warmth because we have a new and valuable friend. Mr. Speaker, when we again discuss the ways in which we may achieve understanding between our Nation and other nations in the world, I would like to suggest that we consider simply inviting some of our fellow citizens of the world to come and work beside us until we become friends rather than strangers.●

FREE ENTERPRISE: THREATENED, OR GONE?

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a concerned constituent which I believe must be shared at least in part with my colleagues in the House. The individual in question has set down in jarringly accurate words an opinion which I believe is shared by the majority of the American people. This individual has dared to see beyond the "media hype" which inevitably accompanies any effort to reduce the Federal budget. He is not afraid to call the situation as he sees it, nor is he unwilling to outline his own circumstances for us.

I trust that every man and woman in this Chamber will take the time to read my constituent's words, and to re-

flect upon the very real questions he has raised: Should Americans be expected to love their Government more than their children? Should more be provided to the Government? Finally, and most seriously, is free enterprise really a thing of the past in this Nation? I say no to all three, and I sincerely hope my colleagues will have the wisdom to do likewise.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. SHUMWAY: The media are currently filled with stories of the suffering that will be caused by loss of Federal aid if the President's budget is passed. Many congressmen are publicly proclaiming that the tax cut will have to go.

Well, I just completed my tax return, and I'm angry. My tax bill, combining Federal income tax, state income tax and FICA is \$53.00/day, 365 days per year. That of course, doesn't count sales tax, tax on gasoline, etc., etc. By way of comparison, my support payment for two children I dearly love is \$11.50/day, 365 days per year. I love my country, but do you think I love it more than my children?

I wouldn't want to leave the impression I'm well-to-do. My wife and I live in an apartment. We cannot afford to buy a house. I buy virtually everything for cash, and we are not indebted for anything. However, we drive a 1970 model automobile and I ride my bicycle to work to avoid owning two cars. We have essentially no savings and no investments. My job, and hers, are our sole income.

The gentlemen and ladies of congress, and their predecessors have created a welfare state. Our free enterprise system is not just threatened, it is gone.●

A FEDERAL SUBSIDY FOR CRIME

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, among the multitudinous insurance programs operated by the Federal Government is the Federal crime insurance program.

It was established in 1971 as an insurer of last resort for people who live in high crime areas. As one might suspect, however, the income the Government receives from premiums is far outdistanced by the payouts. In fiscal year 1980, the Federal crime insurance program collected \$13.9 million and paid out \$51 million for a \$37.1 million loss. In fiscal year 1981, the income was \$13.4 million and the payout was \$47.1 million, for a \$33.7 million loss.

Maybe Lloyd's London should insure the Federal crime insurance program.

Apparently, the administration has marked the program for oblivion, and with good reason.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1982]

U.S. AS INSURER OF LAST RESORT

That feeling of violation when you come home to a ransacked house or apartment is bad enough. The disaster is complete when there is no insurance on the stolen goods.

In the past, in many areas of high crime, insurance was either prohibitively expensive or not available. To remedy that, the Federal Government 11 years ago established the Federal Crime Insurance Program. Since then the program has grown to cover 72,000 policyholders in 27 states.

Last month, for example, a brownstone owner in Brooklyn received a check for \$1,300 to cover losses of silverware, jewelry, a television set and damage to a roof hatch caused by a break-in. For the owner, the Government was the insurer of last resort because he lived in a high-crime area.

Now, however, the Federal insurance program is threatened by budget cuts. The office that administers the program, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, says that if the cutback proposals are adopted for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1, it would mean that new policies could be written only until the last day of September.

Existing policies would remain in force until they expire, and that would be the end of the program, said Cheri Steffek, a public affairs officer.

"If the Government doesn't cover these people, and private industry won't, who will?" asked H. Trainor Roden, press secretary to Representative Bill Green, Republican of Manhattan.

A House appropriations subcommittee is tentatively scheduled to hold hearings on the crime insurance program and the agency's flood insurance program next Tuesday and Wednesday. The ranking Republican on the committee is Mr. Green, and many of his constituents are purchasers or potential buyers of the crime insurance. According to figures supplied by Mr. Green's office, New York State residents held 54,000 policies as of September 1980. Florida was next with 5,000 policyholders.

The Government subsidy of the program runs into the millions. In the 1980 fiscal year that began Oct. 1, 1979, premiums plus expenses amounted to \$13.9 million, while the Government paid out \$51 million. In the 1981 fiscal year, income was \$13.4 million and outgo was \$47.1 million.

In the past, the Federal insurance was attacked as a bargain for the wealthy who were able to cover jewels and furs much cheaper than with private coverage. Two years ago, the Government tightened up. It limited its liability to \$500 in the burglary or robbery of jewelry, furs, fine arts, antiques and similar items, saying that the insurance was intended mainly to protect necessities, such as furnishings and clothing. The insurance costs \$50 a year for \$1,000 coverage, up to \$120 a year for \$10,000 coverage for household losses. Businesses can get up to \$15,000 for coverage with rates varying according to business classification and location.

The insurance can be purchased through regular insurance agents. Applicants are not required to prove that they cannot obtain commercial insurance, and the policies are not canceled because of losses. For further information, call 800-638-8780 or write the Federal Crime Insurance Program, Box 41033, Washington, D.C. 20814.●

PUBLIC HEALTH EXPERTS OPPOSE THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLEAN AIR BILL

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the House Energy and Commerce Committee begins today our markup of the administration-backed clean air proposal. Unfortunately, the direct and adverse impacts of the legislation have not been adequately highlighted by the news media. But the legislation has not completely escaped the notice of public health experts who are deeply concerned about clean air.

Sponsors of this legislation hope to convince the Congress that this legislation will have a benign impact on air quality. But I believe that our colleagues should know that the experts have reached a different conclusion.

H.R. 5252, the administration's rewrite of the Clean Air Act, has been condemned by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Preventive Medicine, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the Coalition of Health and the Environment, and many, many others.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the thoughtful messages which I have received urging opposition to this bill:

FEBRUARY 8, 1982.

HON. TOBY MOFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOFFETT: As health organizations, we have a major interest in the public health policies established in the Clean Air Act which protect against the adverse health effects of air pollution. The authors of H.R. 5252 are to be commended for retaining the language in the current Act relative to the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and the standard setting process. The NAAQS must continue to protect the health of the most sensitive groups in the population with an adequate margin of safety. Further, because they protect public health, there is some urgency in attaining them.

However, the action of retaining the health-based standards appears to be a meaningless gesture when in reality the amendments proposed in H.R. 5252 are a comprehensive package to relax major provisions of the Act responsible for the progress made towards attaining healthful air quality.

Our specific concerns are as follows:

1. Section 172 Attainment Date Extensions: H.R. 5252 provides for extensions of the deadlines until 1993 for all regions of the country. H.R. 5252 provides no incentives for areas to meet the standards by earlier dates.

Data collected by the National Commission on Air Quality indicates that only 8-10 regions of the country will be unable to attain the standards by the current dead-

lines. The extension provision of H.R. 5252 is an overreaction to this problem.

2. Section 173 Permit Requirements: H.R. 5252 would repeal provisions in the nonattainment program which are among the most effective tools for achieving progress towards healthful air quality. The bill would repeal the requirement that new sources offset their additional pollution by reducing emissions from existing sources and the requirement that new sources achieve the "lowest achievable emission rate"; relax the requirement for automobile inspection and maintenance programs which are designed to ensure that pollution control equipment operates properly; and relax permit requirements for new sources.

3. Title II Emission Standards for Moving Sources: H.R. 5252 would relax the federal auto emissions control program by doubling the auto emission standards for carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen. Further, the standards would be minimum standards—EPA through rule-making would be permitted to adjust those standards after 1986 although they could not be made more stringent even if needed to protect public health.

H.R. 5252 would also relax the program for heavy duty vehicles. The Act now requires a phase-in of standards for heavy duty trucks that are as protective as those for automobiles. Trucks represent the greatest untapped source for emissions reductions needed in many areas to attain the standards. The bill would eliminate any requirement for improved technology on heavy duty vehicles.

4. National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: H.R. 5252 fails to address needed improvements in section 112 to control emissions of hazardous air pollutants. The current Act's authority to regulate these pollutants has not proven sufficient. In 10 years, EPA has regulated only four of the dozens of hazardous air pollutants found in the ambient air. H.R. 5252 would leave this present ineffective program in place.

Progress towards clean and healthful air must continue. Prudent public health policy dictates that a strong Clean Air Act be reauthorized to ensure timely attainment of the NAAQS. H.R. 5252 represents a relaxation of the federal air pollution control program, and as such we cannot endorse it as a mechanism for reauthorization of the Clean Air Act.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Medical Student Association, American Nurses' Association, American Public Health Association, American Teachers of Preventive Medicine, Association of Schools of Public Health, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Coalition for Health and the Environment, National Environmental Health Association, National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons, National Women's Health Network.

JOINT COUNCIL OF
ALLERGY AND IMMUNOLOGY,
Mount Prospect, Ill., March 12, 1982.

Hon. TOBY MOFFETT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOFFETT: The Joint Council of Allergy and Immunology, a socio-economic-political organization sponsored by the four

major allergy organizations, is aware of your stance in several areas.

For your information, the attached position statement on the Clean Air Act was adopted by the Joint Council of Allergy and Immunology Board of Directors on March 4, 1982, and is sent to you for your information and use.

Secondly, the Joint Council of Allergy and Immunology is an integral part of an interdisciplinary effort to communicate to Congress its concern about disease prevention. We are part of a Congressional Communications Seminar on May 6, 1982, entitled "Disease Prevention Through the Immunization Process."

We think it is most appropriate that you and your staff be invited to this seminar. Information as to the time and place of the seminar will be sent to you in a subsequent mailing.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. BECKER, M.D.,
Executive Vice President.

P.S.—We have a mutual friend... Dr. Andy Canzonetti. He and I have worked together for several years in the effort of cost-effective care through the utilization review process. This comment is for your information!

[Adopted by the Joint Council of Allergy and Immunology Board of Directors on March 4, 1982]

RESOLUTION

The Clean Air Act passed in 1970 and amended in 1977 has been helpful in improving the quality of our nation's air. Its success indicates that there is a continuing need for its existence and for continued funding and function of the Environmental Protection Agency. We recommend the reenactment of the Federal Clean Air Act.

It is essential to maintain the current standards of the Act. Any changes in the standards should be based solely on scientific data to do otherwise would result in further damage to our Nation's air with potential adverse effects on humans, animals and agriculture.

Short term standards should be maintained with regard to the various air pollutants specified in the Act.

The standards for automotive emissions should be maintained. New standards should be developed with respect to emissions from diesel fueled vehicles.

Air quality standards should be developed for sources of indoor air pollution whether in occupational, home or public environments.

The Act should provide for the study of any newly identified air pollutants.●

CAN'T MANIPULATE ONE'S SELF-ESTEEM

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial written by a distinguished American, Mr. George Whitney, and which appeared in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune on Saturday, March 13, 1982:

CAN'T MANIPULATE ONE'S SELF-ESTEEM

It is axiomatic that self-doubt and uncertainty can be manipulated, but self-esteem can't. With subliminal, unperceived, silent allurements, Americans have been persuaded to reverse their patriotism and duty to country and fellow citizens into overt disloyalty and cowardly deceit.

These lies, poured constantly into their minds, have confused them, manipulated them, and ignominiously led them into carrying out the designs of their enemies. Now they are perilously close to their self-destruction still firmly believing the biggest lie of all: "That all we have to fear is fear itself."

How can Americans separate the truth from the lies?

One way only. They must ask themselves if the act is meant to help their country.

Social welfare of other nations has no place in this picture. Our leaders have pounded relentlessly into our ears that what is good for the world is good for us.

This is a lie.

The truth is that wealth cannot be shared. Only poverty can be shared.

Have the American people grown so weak-willed, so purposeless, so unthinking that they are content to give up their sovereignty and with it their property, their mobility, and their lives rather than become alert to their real and present dangers? Do they now choose to ignore what their elected and unelected leaders are doing to their country? Is it possible that they really do not care?●

A TIME FOR GRATITUDE, A TIME FOR ACTION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a year ago today, we prayed that our President and three other men would survive the handgun attack that felled them in broad daylight on the streets of Washington. Our prayers were answered.

Today, President Reagan is vigorous and whole. Two others have mended and recovered. The courageous Jim Brady fights on to recuperate from his awful wounds.

I give thanks today that these men have been spared. I pray that Jim Brady will continue his astonishing comeback.

In the intervening year, however, thousands of victims of handgun violence have not been spared. They are dead—many, many of them at the hands of criminals, drug addicts, and mental incompetents.

These persons have no right to a gun. Yet they can obtain them with ease. The President's accused assailant is proof of this. It is time for the Congress to act. We must pass legislation that has a chance of denying handguns to felons, addicts, incompetents, and would-be assassins without denying them to sportsmen and other responsible citizens who feel they need a

gun for their own protection. And we must make it clear that anyone using a handgun in commission of a crime faces certain imprisonment.

This issue is marked by deep emotional divisions. But I do not believe that sportsmen, hunters, and gun collectors are unyielding foes of handgun legislation. They are good and reasonable citizens.

Finding a solution to this issue is one of the true tests of government. A civilized society demands that we find a compromise—now—that could lead to the arrest of violence and killing in our Nation.●

KATYN MASSACRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the situation in Poland continues to deteriorate, I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the anniversary of one of the most diabolical of the Soviet Government crimes. I refer to the Katyn Forest massacre in which approximately 15,000 Polish Army officers were murdered by their Russian captors on March 30, 1946, in the Katyn Forest area of the Ukraine.

It was one of the major war crimes committed during World War II for which no one was ever punished, and it was deliberately ignored by President Franklin Roosevelt in order not to offend the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's methodical eradication of leaders of the Polish military was followed by similar practices throughout Eastern Europe during and after World War II.

The Katyn massacre was not just another war atrocity executed in the blind fury of a battlefield. It was a premeditated, planned, mass murder and should have been classified as a crime against humanity and brought to the docket of the International War Crimes Tribunal in Nuremberg.

On December 22, 1952, a select committee of the U.S. House, after a thorough investigation, made its final report. It formally accused the Soviet Government of the Katyn crime and asked the State Department to present the case to the United Nations. Although, since that time, there has been occasional discussion of the event, the committee's groundwork has never been effectively implemented.

The Katyn massacre was, and remains, a classic example of the untrustworthiness of the Communists. It is especially important that we ponder the historic lesson of the Katyn massacre at a time when the administration is confronting the Soviet Union regarding its foreign policy activities.

Mr. Speaker, history dictates that until legitimate legal action is taken against the Soviets, the victims of the Katyn massacre and the thousands of other Polish troops who gave their life for freedom during World War II have died in vain.●

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1982

HON. BOB SHAMANSKY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. SHAMANSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a second bill to improve the investment practices and increase the rate of return of the social security trust funds. This measure builds upon legislation I introduced last September, which was also intended to improve the investment practices of the social security trust funds.

The three social security trust funds earned a scandalously low rate of return in fiscal year 1980. The recent annual report of combined earnings were a shockingly low 8.3 percent in fiscal 1980 on the \$47 billion in the trust funds. Others, investing exclusively in government or government-backed securities, earned as much as 13.5 percent in 1980. An additional \$2 billion would have been generated if the trust funds had earned more realistic yields.

It is too soon to determine the exact yield for the trust fund investments in 1981, but taking September 1981, as representative of the year, we see that the low earnings trend has continued. In that month, the combined trust funds earned 10 percent on their investments. U.S. Treasury securities were typically yielding 15 to 16 percent during this same period. Financial institutions investing exclusively in government or government-backed securities should earn over 15 percent on their investments in 1981.

To insure that the trust funds receive a yield that is consistent with that of comparable funds, several changes must be made in the investment system. The bill I am introducing will do two things:

First, the bill will create an account for each trust fund much like a savings account, with interest compounded quarterly.

Second, the bill will provide that the interest paid to each account will be the higher of two formulas: One weighted toward long-term rates and the other weighted toward short-term rates.

Recently we have been told that the poor condition of the social security trust funds requires that we either drastically reduce benefits or raise

social security taxes. If the social security trust funds had earned better yields on their investments, the system would be in appreciably better financial condition. Low yields cost social security about \$2 billion in 1980 and a similar amount in 1981. Given the present economic difficulties of the system, there is no excuse not to maximize the yield to the ailing trust funds.

Current social security investment practices are not suited for the current demands being placed upon the system or for modern economic conditions. When the social security system was established in 1935, the trust funds were seen as a cushion, a "margin of safety" against obligations of the system. It was not expected that the trust funds would have to be drawn on to meet social security obligations. Accordingly, the two largest trust funds—old age and survivors insurance (OASI) and disability insurance (DI)—had assets equal to 200 percent of fiscal outlays in 1960. By 1970 this figure had dropped to 105 percent. During the next 10 years, the funds continued to be drawn upon to meet social security obligations. In 1980 the funds had only 23 percent of that year's outlays. The margin of safety was gone. Even if they borrow from each other, the three funds will be exhausted by 1985.

Also, throughout the history of the social security system, interest rates have been fairly static. Investment procedures are predicated upon static interest rates and are unable to cope with the fluctuating rates that we recently have experienced and in all likelihood will continue to experience.

The trust funds are currently investing in special issues written expressly for them by the Treasury. These issues are assigned a statutorily determined yield and a fixed date of maturity, though there is no penalty for early redemption. Yields to the issues are weighted in favor of long-term rates, which have traditionally been higher than short-term rates. Recently, however, being weighted toward long-term rates has been a great disadvantage, since short-term rates have soared above long-term rates.

At the time of purchase, maturities for that year's issues are spread over a 15 year period. When they are redeemed, those of the nearest maturity date earning the lowest yield are redeemed first. This procedure does not insure that those special issues with the lowest interest rate will be redeemed first. As a result, when the trust funds are being drawn upon to meet obligations and special issues are being redeemed early, the yield suffers.

There are other examples of the confusion created by the current investment system. When interest rates

fluctuate, the trust funds earn a yield that is not consistent with interest rates due to the system of special issues with their dated yields and distant maturities. Also, allowing the special issues to be redeemed early without penalty distorts the earnings of the trust funds, making it difficult to determine the fund's financial status and adding to the great public confusion surrounding the status of social security investments.

The existing system is misleading; it maintains the appearance of being similar to the investment practices of a private fund by investing in issues. In reality, it does not function like a private trust fund at all. It does not shop around for issues, but has the Treasury write special issues. The managers of the fund do not try to anticipate the direction of interest rates, but set maturities in a mechanical fashion. The managers do not redeem the lowest earning issues first, but stodgily go up the list, redeeming whatever issue is next in line. It is no wonder that yields to the trust funds are so low—or that the social security system is in trouble.

This bill would eliminate the existing bizarre system of special issues and mechanical redemption which has led to such poor yields and replace it with a system designed for current and future needs. This bill would replace an outmoded system with a better and simpler one.

First, this bill would create an account for each trust fund, which would earn interest like a savings account. This would eliminate the need for special issues, maturities, redemptions, redemption-without-penalty, and so forth. The bill would eliminate the need for personnel to manage the complex existing system.

Second, this bill would require that interest be compounded quarterly, thus insuring that the yield to the trust funds is in line with the cost of borrowing by Treasury from the public on any given day. It would then be easier to determine the assets of the funds.

Finally, this bill would require that the yield to the funds be the higher of two statutorily determined formulas. One, the existing formula, is the rate of interest equal to the average market yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government which are not due for at least 4 years. The other, weighted toward short-term rates, will be the rate of interest equal to the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government which are due in less than 4 years.

In this way, we insure that the social security trust funds earn a yield that is up to date and consistent with that earned by a wise investor—unlike the existing system which assumes finan-

cial ignorance on the part of the managing trustees.

An important first step toward improving the financial position of the social security system is to reform its investment practices which have cost it billions due to low yields. A necessary step toward simplifying and improving Government is to eliminate complex and outdated systems. The current social security investment practices may have been appropriate in 1935. They are clearly not appropriate today. Thank you.

H.R. 5987

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for increased earnings of interest by the social security trust funds, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Social Security Trust Funds Improvement Act of 1982".

INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUNDS IN SOCIAL SECURITY SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

SEC. 2. (a)(1) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) are repealed.

(2) Section 201 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(d) The Managing Trustee shall maintain on deposit in the social security savings account established for each of the Trust Funds under subsection (e) such portion of such Trust Fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals from such Trust Fund.

"(e)(1) There is established in the general fund of the Treasury for each Trust Fund a social security savings account (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "account") for each Trust Fund. The amount deposited in each account shall accrue interest, compounded quarterly, payable on the last business day of each quarter from other amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and determined on the basis of the average daily account balance for each quarter.

"(2) Amounts of a Trust Fund while on deposit in any such account shall not be available for any purpose of such Trust Fund. Such amounts may be withdrawn from such account at any time for use by such Trust Fund.

"(3) The rate of interest accrued under paragraph (1) during each quarter shall be fixed on the last business day of such quarter and shall be equal to the greater of—

"(A) the average market yield (computed by the Managing Trustee on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding such business day) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month, or

"(B) the average market yield (computed by the Managing Trustee on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding such business day) on all other marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt;

except that in any case in which such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, such rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent nearest such market yield.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'Trust Fund' means—

"(A) the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund,

"(B) the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund,

"(C) the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, and

"(D) the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund."

(b)(1) Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) are repealed.

(2) Section 1817 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Managing Trustee shall maintain on deposit in the social security savings account established for the Trust Fund under section 201(e) such portion of the Trust Fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals from the Trust Fund."

(c)(1) Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) are repealed.

(2) Section 1841 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Managing Trustee shall maintain on deposit in the social security savings account established for the Trust Fund under section 201(e) such portion of the Trust Fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals from the Trust Fund."

APPLICABILITY OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

SEC. 3. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757b) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "Act,"; and

(2) by inserting after "Treasury," the following: "and amounts on deposit in social security savings accounts established in the general fund of the Treasury under section 201(e) of the Social Security Act".

EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect October 1, 1982.

(b)(1)(A) The public-debt obligations of the United States outstanding as of October 1, 1982, which were authorized to be issued exclusively for purchase by the Trust Funds under the provisions of the Social Security Act amended by this Act shall be redeemed at par on such date.

(B) Other interest-bearing obligations of the United States and obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States in which portions of the Trust Funds have been invested and which are outstanding as of October 1, 1982, shall be redeemed at par plus accrued interest at maturity, except that such obligations may be sold before maturity at the market price.

(C) The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in each Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of such Trust Fund.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "Trust Fund" means—

(A) the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund,

(B) the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund,

(C) the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, and

(D) the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.●

WORKING PEOPLE AND THEIR UNIONS OPPOSE H.R. 5252

ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, my office has been hit by a barrage of comments from concerned citizens regarding the pending reauthorization of the Clean Air Act. Citizens of this Nation realize that this law is not perfect; but, they are also able to distinguish between genuine proposals for reform and a gutting of this basic pollution-control legislation.

Recently, I received some helpful comments from Union representatives stating their opposition to the administration-backed clean air bill, H.R. 5252. I wanted to share with my colleagues their responsible observations about a truly antienvironmental bill.

UIW—SEAFARERS

Columbus, Ohio, March 4, 1982.

Hon. Congressman MOFFETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN. I am writing this letter to inform you of my position on H.R. 5252, H. Res. 252 and H.R. 4829 regarding Clean Air Legislation.

I oppose H.R. 5252 because it would seriously weaken the Clean Air Act by such things as changing the deadline for meeting health standards from 1982 to as late as 1993, would double the carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide standards in automobiles and also does nothing to control acid rain or airborne toxic pollutants.

I support H. Res. 252 because it calls for maintaining an effective program for healthy air in our cities, keeping strong emissions standards for autos, protecting all clean air regions, and taking action against the problem of acid rain.

I also support H.R. 4829 as this bill would decrease the production of sulfur oxides by 10 million tons over the next several years.

I ask that you support my position on these bills.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM JAMES DOBBINS,
President, Local 20,
United Industrial Workers Union.

FEBRUARY 24, 1982.

IN SUPPORT OF CLEAN AIR

Statement by: Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, International Chemical Workers Union, Allied Industrial Workers of America International Union, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, International Molders and Allied Workers Union, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, and United Steelworkers of America

Contact Bill Klinefelter, (202) 637-5198.

Congressional reauthorization of the Clean Air Act raises many issues of vital concern to the labor movement. The issues of jobs and the health of our members and their families are fundamental priorities for the labor movement. We are issuing this

statement in support of maintaining a strong Clean Air Act because such an Act has been responsive to our needs for both secure jobs and healthy environment.

H.R. 5252, the Luken-Broyhill bill, strikes at the basic national commitment to and regulatory system for attainment of a healthful and clean air environment. We oppose H.R. 5252 and join with enforcement professionals, like the State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators, and health organizations, like the American Lung Association, in urging Congress not to accept this bill as a vehicle for "fine tuning" of the Clean Air Act.

The health of our members is dependent upon the interplay of both the community environment and the workplace environment, and it is an inescapable economic fact that workers want and need secure jobs. To this end, we have supported the Clean Air Act which, while forcing pollution abatement, has not been detrimental to economic growth. Indeed, environmental enforcement promotes more secure jobs through its emphasis upon modernization and increased industrial efficiency. The objectives of health and jobs have not been contradictory. The November, 1981 AFL-CIO policy resolution on the environment clearly articulates our belief of the compatibility of these goals and the need to "adamantly resist attempts to gut one objective in favor of the other."

We reject the approach embodied in H.R. 5252 which, if enacted, would seriously weaken the environmental and health progress being achieved by the present Clean Air Act. H.R. 5252 does in fact weaken or eliminate key provisions of the environmental health regulatory system. It would, for instance:

Eliminate the requirement that polluters use lowest achievable emission rate technologies currently required in nonattainment (i.e., health-hazard) areas;

Require in nonattainment areas only a substantially weakened best achievable control technology (BACT) which is currently required for clean air areas;

Automatically repeal the increment system for Class II and III designated areas which were designed to limit the growth and level of pollution in clean air areas;

Effectively repeal current sanctions against lax state enforcement and modify the penalties against industrial polluters—hardly an incentive for ensuring continued progress;

Allow health-hazard areas to unduly extend attainment deadlines from 1982 to 1993, even though very few areas need such extension, particularly for such prolonged periods; and

Eliminate mandatory offsets and other technology-based conditions on new industrial facilities in non-attainment areas, even where offsets and new technology are needed to allow plant expansion and modernization while assuring progress toward meeting health standards.

In addition, H.R. 5252 fails to address two issues included in the AFL-CIO resolution: a speed-up in the implementation of hazardous pollutants program; and measures to control acid rain. We believe that the approach spelled out in H.R. 5252 not only is destructive, short-sighted, and unnecessary, but also unduly prolongs a threat to the community and workplace health of Americans.

Protecting "clean" air areas and cleaning up "dirty" areas are both vitally important. In accomplishing these purposes there is no conflict between economic and environmen-

tal interests. A healthy economy cannot exist in a devastated environment. By forcing "dirty" (nonattainment) areas to clean up—thus reversing the deterioration of the infrastructure in older, industrial areas—the Clean Air Act compels companies to introduce new technologies and modernize facilities which result in more productive, efficient, and competitive operations, thus making jobs more secure in those areas. By controlling the rate at which "clean" areas may be polluted (prevention of significant deterioration), the Clean Air Act slows the wasteful exodus of industries from the "dirty" Northeast and Midwestern regions and California to the "clean" Sunbelt and Western states.

Claims that weakening the Clean Air Act is necessitated by the present economic situation and the need to promote job growth and security are simply false. Pollution abatement and job security go hand in hand—environmental regulations have not been the primary cause of even one plant shutdown. It is a fact that deteriorating and obsolete facilities, which also are polluters, are vulnerable to economic collapse and plant closings. In these cases, job losses are more accurately attributable to the lack of modernization than to environmental protections. Furthermore, the lack of strong clean-up efforts in severely polluted areas makes them less desirable places for investments in new plants and equipment and other types of economic growth. Moreover, the Clean Air Act directly creates jobs in abatement industries. A recent EPA study estimates that some 525,000 jobs will be created by 1987 if current environmental enforcement standards continue in effect.

While we believe that the Clean Air Act should be amended to provide more efficient and effective administration and to avoid unnecessary delays and cumbersome procedures which can be an impediment to economic growth, radical revisions, such as those proposed in H.R. 5252, should be rejected. Furthermore, revisions should not be seen as a remedy for the current economic situation. Unemployment, high interest rates, import problems, and depressed industrial demand, exacerbated by the current Administration's economic policies, are the real problems, and need to be addressed through direct measures. Sacrificing the Clean Air Act not only will fail to solve these economic problems, but also will increase health risks and contribute to the undermining of job security for American workers.

Lloyd McBride, President, United Steelworkers of America; Dominick D'Ambrosio, President, Allied Industrial Workers of America International Union; George Robinson, Director, Occupational Safety and Health, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; Frank Martino, President, International Chemical Workers Union; Jacob Sheinkman, Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union; Carl Studenroth, President, International Molders and Allied Workers Union; Robert Goss, President, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union.●

THE IRS STRIKES AMERICANS EVERYWHERE

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, additional examples of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act [TPA] are the following excerpts from letters I have received from across the Nation.

FROM KENTUCKY

I have been harassed by the IRS for years 1972-1976. They have never collected one thin dime in additional taxes but it has cost me thousands of dollars in legal fees for defense.

FROM COLORADO

I have been under constant investigation by the IRS for the past four years. . . . When I asked why the continuous harassment, I was informed they did not like my accountant. I changed accountant firms and now a new investigator is assigned to me. She has worked steady on my records for July, August, and September. Now I have heard nothing until they have proposed that I sign a paper to allow continuous checking of my taxes. (My accountant's fee is \$70 per hour so I really don't need much more of this harassment).

I thoroughly believe in our tax system, have always paid my taxes—have asked these IRS investigators what I am doing wrong and they just say I'll have to ask my accountant. I've even tried to contact the head of the IRS here and he will not talk to me or return my calls. What possible recourse do we have against this harassment?

FROM TENNESSEE

Your efforts to curb the excesses of the Internal Revenue Service are of vital importance to all Americans. You are the first national leader to come forward with a reasonable legislative program designed to control the IRS. I am chilled to the bone when I realize that the IRS has been able to usurp a growing list of KGB-type methods with scarcely a murmur from the majority.

AGAIN FROM COLORADO

. . . No one wishes any more than we tax preparers do that your bill H.R. 4931—the Taxpayer Protection Act—will pass the House. It just has to go into effect or the American people are going to revolt even more than as now. Every American we talk to has had it with this out-of-control IRS. It is inconceivable that our Congress has let an agency—not even Bureau status—take over such power that even Congress can do nothing with them. . . .

FROM KANSAS

I read your article in the American Legion Magazine of December 1981 and was appalled at the power of the Internal Revenue Service. Although I have heard and read of the tactics of this government agency, it is good to learn of some of the facts. I am 66 years old, a veteran of two wars, now retired from a railroad company. It is astonishing that the American people will sit idly by and let these things go unnoticed. As we all recall, Adolph Hitler used these tactics in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Germany in the late 1930's and early 40's and we all know what happened to him. If we live under a curtain of fear what next? The average citizen cannot fight Internal Revenue Service because he cannot afford it. Would a gambler spend five dollars to earn one? Definitely not. It might be, and possibly is, later than we think. If the power of the IRS is not curbed in some way, what will happen in the next 20 years? The liberty and dignity of the American people are fast being eroded by the Gestapo tactics of the IRS. Many small businesses are being wiped out by the IRS, this is strictly a shame because they are the backbone of this nation. Well, just a word to let you know that one war veteran read your article and am certainly concerned about it.

FROM TEXAS

. . . If there was ever an agency of the federal government that needed scrutiny, it is the Internal Revenue Service. And unless Congress is deliberately trying to cover up the scandalous behavior of the IRS, they would be well advised to hold these hearings.

FROM NEW YORK

I wholeheartedly agree with you that congressional legislation is needed to put the IRS in its proper place and restrict it from resorting to abusive, un-American and unconstitutional practices in collecting revenues.

FROM MICHIGAN

I agree wholeheartedly with you that the Internal Revenue Service has gone too far when they use the concept of "fear" to force people to pay their taxes. Some people actually overpay their taxes to avoid a possible confrontation or a lengthy court battle which would take them away from their jobs and possible loss of pay. The fear concept may actually be encouraging the 97 percent of people who cheerfully pay their taxes to cheat. The concept of power-mad IRS agents to be able to seize taxpayer property or private homes without a court order is totally repulsive to me and millions of other people.

During World War II another individual used fear as a means of subjugating an entire nation and was in the process of subjugating an entire continent. His name was Adolph Hitler.●

UNITED STATES EPITOMIZES THE SPIRIT OF VOLUNTARISM AND PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 150 years ago that the French statesman Alexis De Tocqueville commented on the amazing spirit of voluntarism and public service that he witnessed in our communities. Wherever there was a wrong to be redressed or a problem to be surmounted, the people of our towns and cities would voluntarily come together to find solutions.

It is this spirit of voluntarism on the part of the Hispanic Women's Council, which is celebrating its ninth anniversary as a community service organiza-

tion in southern California, that I would like to bring to the attention of this House. The Hispanic Women's Council is recognized as a leader in motivating women's participation in civic, educational, cultural, and community-service activities in an effort to give individuals more control over their own lives. Recognizing the need for education among the Hispanic youth of its community, the Hispanic Women's Council has met the challenge, taking a leadership role in promoting the educational betterment of women and youth. In doing so, this all-volunteer organization has provided opportunities for personal growth, stimulating untapped potential from its members and the surrounding community.

Volunteer service to the community is in the best tradition of American citizenship. I think I can speak for the entire House in expressing our appreciation to the Hispanic Women's Council, and the excellent leadership provided by its president, Gilda Bojorquez-Gjurich, for its many contributions to the residents of southern California, and wishing these dedicated women even more success in the future.●

GEORGE DE VOS: HE CATERS TO SAN DIEGO

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, George De Vos has been a leading restaurateur and caterer in the San Diego area since 1949: a well-known personality with a little-known past. A recent column by Frank Rhoades of the San Diego Union traces the colorful background of this prominent San Diegan. Beginning with his youth in war-torn Belgium, the article follows George through his years among the Hollywood elite as manager of the famed Mocambo nightclub of the forties. It continues with the account of how, over the next 20 years, he went on to establish himself as a cornerstone of the San Diego restaurant business.

Mr. Speaker, George De Vos is a fascinating entrepreneur in the best American tradition and the account of his personal history and accomplishments makes for fascinating reading. Therefore, I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

GEORGE DE VOS

At age 73, durable George De Vos is adding a second responsibility to his managerial duties with Servomation.

In addition to running the food operation in the Stadium Club at San Diego Jack

Murphy Stadium, he will become food and beverage boss at the Community Concourse, April 1.

Since he came here in 1949, De Vos has been a top man in the restaurant and catering business, therefore has been a familiar figure to thousands.

But acquaintanceships mostly were superficial. Few learned, for example, that during the movies' so-called Golden Years, it was up to George to keep the stars happy at the Palm Springs Racquet Club and later at the famed Hollywood night spot Mocambo.

Virtually none knew that as a child in Belgium during World War I, he was gassed by German soldiers and once was totally blind.

This was not because George lives up to his last name, De Vos, in Dutch, meaning the fox.

Cunning, indeed, is not part of his makeup.

He sticks to current subjects in all conversations, and always has seemed to take the position no one is interested in the past.

De Vos is a friendly, soft-spoken man, as conservative as his Harris tweed jackets.

As far as his business life is concerned, he has only one great regret.

That is having sold the Valley Ho restaurant in Mission Valley to Bob Pastore in 1971. Pastore gave the operation an entirely different concept and changed the name to Caesar's.

To this day, De Vos speaks lovingly of the Valley Ho: "The best thing that ever happened to me."

But not as good, of course, as recovering from blindness caused by the German gas.

George Caesar De Vos was born to the family of a Belgium builder on Dec. 3, 1908. In 1913, before the outbreak of World War I, the De Voses moved to Detroit, where they had relatives. The newcomers did not like life in this country and soon elected to return to Wacken, their village in East Belgium.

Young Georges was sent ahead in 1914 with an adult who also was returning to Wacken. The boy would put up with his grandmother until his family arrived.

Before the elder De Voses could complete arrangements to leave for Wacken, the war heated up. Georges (he kept the "s" until he was an adult) remembers:

"A Catholic priest came to take 12 children back from Belgium to Detroit and I was one of them. But my grandmother would not let me leave. My parents remained in Detroit until after the war.

"I remember the day the Germans walked in, wearing green helmets and placing guns on tripods. It was exciting stuff for a kid."

Near the end of the war, the Allies invaded the village and the retreating Germans shelled it with mustard gas.

"Thirteen of us were in a basement. One morning we awakened and all of us were blind. We were taken to a hospital in another town. Two died, having eaten gas-contaminated food.

"We were in the hospital two months before we responded to treatment and regained our sight. Much of the time it seemed I was looking at the world through jelly."

De Vos' family returned to Belgium in February 1919. "I had to be introduced to all of them. I was 11 and we had been separated since I was 5. I had forgotten what they looked like.

"I had a brother now. His name was Marcel. He was an infant then. My parents opened a dry goods store but after 18 months, we all moved back to Detroit. My parents had learned to like it there."

The father became a builder again and Georges was enrolled in a public school, second grade, although he was 12 years old.

"I could speak Flemish (Dutch), French and German but no English. I was so embarrassed I would go home and cry. But I soon learned English and was skipping grades. I graduated in four years."

After high school, George went to Detroit Art Academy, got a job as a commercial artist, and soon lost it. The Great Depression had set in for sure.

The movie industry wallowed in money during the Great Depression, and George De Vos was in a position to watch the glamor people live high on the hog.

De Vos, destined to become a leading restaurateur in San Diego, first watched the stars, the producers and the directors from the sidelines at the Racquet Club in Palm Springs. He was food and beverage manager there, 1936-41.

George went to the Racquet Club to work only one weekend. "The occasion was the Big Top Ball, the leading fund raiser for charity," he recalls. "The owners, (actors) Charlie Farrell and Ralph Bellamy, disagreed on the seating arrangement and split the partnership. Farrell bought Bellamy's interest and put me on full time."

First star De Vos met was Marlene Dietrich, when she ordered a special champagne for a group of friends during a tennis match. It caused something of a stir.

George recalls that director Edmund Goulding must have been the first of the jockers, outside of prizefighters doing road work. "He would run in the desert, then come back and drink bloody Marys.

"Gilbert Roland, Peter Lorre and Paul Lukas went in for fencing. Lana Turner was too young to drink but she would sit in the bar with Greg Bautzer (the lawyer who dated movie queens), making the most of her sweaters.

"Not many stars were club members. The others came as guests of producers and directors."

In '41, De Vos moved to Hollywood as food and beverage boss at the memorable Mocambo nightclub. He became the general manager there in '46 and married Dorothy Morrison, sister of owner Charles Morrison.

Morrison had a small room in the nightclub for rubbernecking tourists, George said. It was called "Siberia." But visiting hicks were not the only ones unwelcomed by Morrison.

George said: "Twice Bing Crosby was turned away at the door because he had no necktie."

Mickey Cohen, the mobster, had a special table. It was in front of two large posts at an end of the dance floor. Mickey ran no risk of getting shot in the back.

George remembers character actor Charles Butterworth as "a friendly man who killed himself in an auto accident, right in front of the Mocambo."

De Vos seems to have split with Morrison before coming to San Diego in 1949. In '37, George had met the late Basil McAfee at Lake Arrowhead. McAfee was out as assistant manager of the U.S. Grant Hotel in '49 and wanted De Vos as a partner in a restaurant venture.

"McAfee had his eye on the waterfront as a location for a restaurant that would be called the Harbor House," said De Vos.

The two became partners, bought a liquor license in Vista and borrowed money on the liquor stock that went with the license.

But Mrs. De Vos was unhappy in San Diego and prevailed upon George to cash

himself out of the partnership and return to Mocambo. That didn't work out and two weeks later the De Voses were back in San Diego. After a while, George would manage the Harbor House that McAfee built with a new partner, Mrs. Faye Scott.

"McAfee had a long lease on the land where he built the Harbor House. It was beside the old ferry landing. He could have paid a monthly rental of \$350 but he had no money and thought it safer to go on a percentage basis.

"We opened on June 3, 1949. By August, the entire investment had been recovered and McAfee was paying \$2,000 a month on a percentage basis."

De Vos and McAfee opened the Secret Harbor restaurant at Fifth and Nutmeg as partners in 1953. De Vos sold his interest to Faye Scott in 1955 and the place was closed a year later after trouble with trade unions.

George stayed as manager of the Harbor House until 1961 when he met Herb Bruggeman at the Mission Bay Golf Club. Paul Zannuch, a liquor salesman, had arranged for De Vos and Bruggeman to golf together.

The upshot was they built the Valley Ho restaurant and opened it the same year. De Vos would manage it. Bruggeman had become wealthy as owner of the Rancho Food Markets. Other stockholders in Valley Ho were Mayor Charles C. Dail, also an owner of Rancho Markets, Charles Sattio, who owned San Diego Fish Co., and Casper Impastato, who was the head bartender.

Valley Ho did an enviable lunch business. The surroundings were elegant and so was the food. De Vos was proud of attracting the cream of the free spenders.

They included such names as the late Marvin K. Brown and Johnny Lyons; Lou Kornik, John Helmer, Larry Barnes and Charlie Pratt.

But the dinner trade was slow. A big, premium-priced restaurant in Mission Valley was to be isolated as a dinner house in the early 1960's. De Vos sold it to Bob Pastore in 1971 and the place became Caesar's.

De Vos then gave full time to catering, enjoyed solid success, and since 1977 has managed Servomation's food operation at the Stadium Club. He will add to his duties the comparable job at the Community Concourse when the Servomation takes over catering there, April 1.

It all started in Los Angeles in 1931. George was a jobless commercial artist. He chanced to meet a man named Abe Spector, who had inherited a small restaurant. Neither knew beans about running a beanery, but Abe hired George as his helper. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF BYELORUSSIA IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark a historic day that is cherished by all freedom loving people who are deeply committed to the ideals of self-

determination and independence of thought and action.

It was 64 years ago on March 25, 1918, that the executive committee of the First Byelorussian National Congress proclaimed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, initiating a period of guaranteed freedom of speech, assembly, and the equality of all citizens under the law.

But, unfortunately that exercise in freedom was short lived. Under the leadership of Lenin, the new imperialistic Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia reconquered the independent Byelorussian state.

To camouflage this aggression, the Moscow regime arranged the formation of its own colonial state, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, on January 1, 1919, in the city of Smolensk.

The Byelorussian people were the victims of both Communist aggression and imperialism, and later, Nazi occupation. But they remained steadfast in their opposition to subjugation. Scores of brave Byelorussian heroes gave their lives in the fierce battle to save their homeland from the brutal Russian Communist forces.

Since 1921, the Russian Communist Party has controlled the internal affairs of Byelorussia, but the cultural heritage of its people has remained one of the strongest and richest in all Europe.

Today the Byelorussian-American community has related to me that it is deeply concerned over the events in Poland. Some 300,000 Byelorussians live in that troubled nation and they have received extremely harsh treatment from the military regime there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support today to a request by the Byelorussian-American community that the Byelorussian language be included as part of our Voice of America programing.

It is vitally important that our Byelorussian brothers know that the people of the United States stand strongly behind their efforts to regain their lost freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, the proud people of Byelorussia are an inspiration to us all and we join them today in the hope that one day their dreams of freedom and independence will be realized.●

A TRIBUTE TO DOUG BROWN, TORRANCE CITY COUNCILMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Doug Brown, an outstanding, dedicated public servant who, after serving as

city councilman for Torrance, Calif., for the past 6 years, is returning full-time to the practice of law.

For those of us who have known Doug and worked with him over the past years, this is an occasion of mixed feelings. We acknowledge his excellent work as councilman on behalf of the residents of Torrance and we regret that he will no longer be as active in the legislative arena. I say "as active" because I am confident that he will not abandon Torrance policymaking entirely.

Doug graduated with honors from the University of Southern California, after which he worked in the U.S. Attorney General's Office. He later became special counsel to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and currently is a partner in the law firm of Rich Ezer.

As councilman, Doug was chairman of council committee on transportation, and was a member of the committee on finance and governmental operations as well as the committee on employee relations and department organization. Outside of the city council, Doug served as president of Behavioral Health Services. This is a nonprofit organization located in the South Bay which works with the area's residence in drug abuse, alcoholism, and senior citizen matters.

Doug has been an active volunteer in many other civic groups, including the Parent Teachers Association the Young Men's Christian Association, the Angeles Council, the Girl Scouts, and the American Youth Soccer Organization.

Mr. Speaker, Doug Brown's dedicated service has touched the lives of many people both within and around the city of Torrance, and his contributions will truly be missed. He has left a mark in the city council which will not be forgotten, but instead will be remembered with appreciation.

My wife, Lee, and I offer our congratulations to him and Torrance upon the accomplishments during his tenure as city councilman. We are confident that he will continue as an inspiring figure in civic and business affairs. We also want to extend to Doug, his wife, Linda, and their children Stephen, David, Lisa, and Michael, our best wishes for a bright and happy future.●

FARM BUSINESS BEING DESTROYED

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, we all know the American agricultural economy is in a desperate condition today, perhaps facing the most serious situa-

tion it has faced since the Great Depression. With farm expenses soaring and cash receipts decreasing, both at an alarming rate, one cannot deny that an emergency truly exists for America's farmers. A young farmer in my district, Roy Dale Purcell, and his wife Marsha, of Boaz, Ky., have written me a very thoughtful letter concerning what is happening to his livelihood. I believe the Purcell's letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time:

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: As an American farmer, I am 31 years old, have a wife, two children, a very comfortable home, own 96 acres and rent 400 acres. Sound great?

Well, until you come to the part that makes it impossible to pay my debts, my life is good. All the elements I have to contend with are seriously destroying my business. I have farmed since the age of seven and even though it's one of the hardest jobs I know of, I enjoy and love my profession.

In 1980, I lost \$22,000 because of drought. This was a disaster area claimed by the government. The only thing that helped me were 5 percent disaster loans from FHA. I lost again in 1981 with a late crop and market prices. We used projected prices and average yields furnished to us by the government for our farm home plan.

Those figures were:

Wheat—35 bushels at \$4 per bushel.

Corn—125 bushels at \$3.50 per bushel.

Soybeans—26 bushels at \$7 per bushel.

We got these yields and prices:

Wheat—33 bushels at \$3 per bushel.

Corn—73 bushels at \$2.48 per bushel.

Soybeans—22 bushels at \$6.23 per bushel.

The yields are our problem, but you can surely help with prices. The price of a loaf of bread is one third of what we get for a bushel of wheat. Does that seem fair to you?

An example for comparison is oil prices. I would guess a barrel of oil at \$30 to \$40 and when it gets to the pumps it's \$1.40 a gallon. We have to buy that barrel of oil and pay that price at the pump. What price we pay is what they asked for the product. Also, we have to pay the asking price for a car or piece of machinery. The organized labor worker got good wages for his hours worked. But, yet when we ask for a decent price, we get laughed at or ignored.

In 1930, half of our population was farmers. Now, it's down to 2.7 percent. Our most precious resource is rich fertile land to produce this nation's food. Before we lose that 2.7 percent farming population, someone had better wake up.

The Farm Bill passed only because the White House wanted it to. It was last on the agenda, a hurried vote so the Congressmen could get home for Christmas, and reported as a \$11 billion bill, so the public thinks it's great. Congressman Hubbard, I commend you for voting the way you saw fit; too bad your fellow Congressmen didn't.

The industrial states are busy making sure all their items get votes on to their liking. They probably just ate dinner and don't realize that someday they might be hungry. Grant you, mining of coal, aluminum and chemicals, harvesting wood, and pumping oil as raw material are just as important as a soybean is to us. We are not expecting nor asking for total attention to the farm product, just equal time.

The federal crop insurance program is a joke. Last year, over half of our burley crop was lost, but we owed a premium of \$126. Knowing this, FHA required us to at least insure our corn this year and we will pay a \$1,885 payment for a 51 bushel corn yield.

Our FHA office is completely understaffed. Graves County has approximately 400 farmers and only one man in the FHA office has the authority to make any decisions. It takes months to get appointments and then they get cancelled. We didn't get our expense money until well into the 1981 crop last year. There are just not enough workers for the workload.

I am a professional in my business. Not college educated, I was taught by generations of farmers. That's the best way to learn. These well taught farmers such as I, are an endangered species.

I hope and will appreciate any and all attention to this issue and expect to hear comments from anyone who gets to read my letter.

An additional thanks for you, Mr. Hubbard, for your concern. I hope you can help.

Sincerely,

ROY DALE PURCELL.
MARSHA PURCELL.●

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACCIDENT AT THREE MILE ISLAND

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, March 29, 1982, marked the 3-year anniversary of the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear facility in Pennsylvania. In the 3 years since the accident, Three Mile Island has stood as a symbol of the failed promise of nuclear power. Careful scrutinization of its current condition and potential for hazard reveals again that any commitment to nuclear power should be abandoned.

Most menacing is the lingering existence of over 1,000,000 gallons of contaminated water in the containment and auxiliary compartments of the plant. The operator of Three Mile Island, General Public Utilities, seems determined to dump the water—once decontaminated—into the adjacent Susquehanna River. However, should that water be dumped in a rush to reopen Three Mile Island, the decontamination mechanism now in use there will stand untested.

Alternative methods for disposing of the water, such as planting it in containment tanks beneath the Earth's surface, are extravagant and beyond our technological know-how. No safe, well-tested alternative for disposing of radioactive water exists.

Continued storage of the contaminated water on the site poses an increasing health risk to plant workers and the surrounding populace. Just last week, fears were raised when a leak of radioactive fuel into a plant control room threatened workers.

The cost and feasibility of cleaning up Three Mile Island demonstrate other liabilities of nuclear power. Once, the expense of cleaning up after an accident was labeled a "hidden cost," but in light of Three Mile Island, it is hidden no more. Estimates for cleaning up the plant range as high as \$1.3 billion. And the slow progress of the cleanup will only inflate the final cost.

At least one official of the Environmental Protection Agency has said that he doubts the plant will ever operate again. General Public Utilities lacks the resources to fund the cleanup and, even with the aid of the Federal Government and certain independent concerns, funding the cleanup in a safe, efficient way may be physically inconceivable.

One aspect of the cleanup gives rise to particular concern. It will be necessary, at some point, to open the damaged reactor's core to remove and dispose of 40,000 twelve-foot-long spent radioactive fuel rods. These rods are constructed of zirconium and house uranium pellets. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has said that many of the rods melted during the accident, leaving the "hot" pellets free to migrate when the core opens. Normally, the rods are removed cautiously by a remote controlled crane. Because of the damage to TMI-2, opening the core could allow the pellets to fall freely to the floor or travel through the reactor.

Even if removal of the spent fuel rods can be performed safely—and evidence suggests that it cannot—the rods will have to be transported and disposed of. Already, spent nuclear fuel rods are being stored and stockpiled in plants all around the Nation. There exists no effective, totally safe method of long-term storage or disposal. And, transportation of the rods through densely populated areas presents a serious threat to human life.

The problems associated with cleaning up Three Mile Island and the accident itself exemplify the many liabilities of nuclear power. None of nuclear power's proponents accounted for these problems before Three Mile Island was erected in the 1970's. They only assured the public that nuclear powerplants were safe and that any resulting crisis could be resolved simply by the industry's technological wizardry. At Three Mile Island, their bag of tricks is apparently empty.

Today, we are at a critical crossroads in determining the future of nuclear power. As a last-gasp effort to revive their imperiled industry, nuclear proponents are claiming again that nuclear power is safe, that the technology is foolproof. For once, public sentiment appears to counter them firmly.

In November of 1981, NBC-TV and the Associated Press conducted a poll in which 56 percent of the respondents

opposed the development of new reactors and 63 percent said they preferred conservation and renewable energy sources to expanded nuclear power.

These responses can be traced greatly to the memory of the Three Mile Island accident. But, just as strongly, unfulfilled promises of economic feasibility and the education of the public about the hazards of nuclear power have slowed, and virtually halted, the continued planning and construction of nuclear power plants. In all, the nuclear industry has received more cancellations than new orders for nuclear facilities over the last 8 years.

What occurred at Three Mile Island on March 29, 1979, should serve as more than an historical footnote. The full extent of the health hazards to the surrounding population is still unknown and may not be known for years. Yet, with the passage of time, the consequences of nuclear power have not faded from public awareness.●

OUR OVERPAID AUTO EXECUTIVES

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, just out of curiosity, after having heard a great deal about the wages of autoworkers, I asked the Congressional Research Service to put together a summary of information comparing the salaries of U.S. auto executives with their counterparts overseas.

The summary follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1982.

To: Honorable Patricia Schroeder.

From: Dick K. Nanto, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, Economics Division.

Subject: Automobile Industry Executive Compensation.

This memorandum is in response to your letter of March 8, 1982, requesting information on executive and management salaries for the U.S. auto industry and for relevant international comparisons.

Table 1 shows the salaries for chief executives of American auto manufacturers for recent years. Around the peak year of 1978, total compensation of nearly a million dollars was not unusual. By 1980, however, compensation had fallen to around a half million dollars, because of the disappearance of bonus payments which are tied to corporate profits. In 1980, none of the major U.S. automakers reported a profit on domestic operations. Note that this definition of compensation does not include benefits, contingent remuneration (deferred compensation and accruals under performance-related long-term incentive plans), or gains from the exercise of stock options and/or stock appreciations.

Although U.S. auto executive compensation might appear high compared with that of the President of the United States or a member of Congress, it is not out of line with compensation in other U.S. industries. In 1978, the \$925,000 in compensation for the President of General Motors was only the seventeenth highest and was less than half the amount received by the highest paid executive in the country. During that year, the \$1,099,000 for Henry Ford II placed him in tenth place behind executives from corporations such as International Harvester, Boeing, and Norton Simon. In 1980, of 940 top officials in 350 of the largest U.S. companies, 60 earned from \$700,000 to \$2,400,000, and 270 earned from \$400,000 to \$700,000. The median pay for board chairmen was \$445,158.¹

The bonus system for top U.S. auto executives automatically reduces total compensation when profits are down. The companies, themselves, also are taking severe cost-cutting measures that are designed to reduce the wage bill for white-collar employees. In December 1981, for example, following similar moves by Chrysler and Ford, General Motors announced that it was eliminating 13,000 salaried jobs and cutting back benefits for 190,000 non-union, white-collar workers.²

According to auto industry analysts, a problem with the management of U.S. auto producers is that they tend to have too many layers of management when compared to those in competitor countries. There are eight to twelve management layers between the factory floor and the chief executive officer in U.S. auto companies, while Japanese and European companies have four to seven.³ Recent efforts by U.S. companies to streamline their operations have eliminated some of these layers, but they still can contribute to inefficiency and to higher pay at the top.

Information on auto company executive compensation in other countries is sparse. The Chairman of Nissan (Datsun) Motors is reported to earn \$140,000, while the top ten

officers at Renault earn, on average \$100,000 per year, with no one's salary exceeding \$150,000.⁴

Gross income for Japanese auto executives as reported on income tax returns for 1977 is shown in Table 2. Gross income is not equal to compensation, because it includes money received from investments, property, and capital gains. The figures in Table 2, therefore, should be considered to be upper bounds and only general indicators of levels of compensation.

Average middle management salaries for all industries in the United States are actually quite low when compared to those in other major countries of the world. In 1979, a survey showed that the average base salary of \$51,400 in the United States placed it in ninth place behind countries such as Spain, Venezuela, Brazil, Germany, and Switzerland, which had the highest (\$99,800).⁵ (See Table 3.)

TABLE 1.—EXECUTIVE SALARIES FOR U.S. AUTOMOBILE PRODUCERS, 1977-80

(In thousands of dollars)

Name, title, and year	Salary	Bonus	Total
General Motors Corp.:			
Thomas A. Murphy, chairman and chief executive officer:			
1980	400		400
1979	367	575	942
1978	350	625	975
1977	350	625	975
Elliott M. Estes, president and chief operating officer:			
1980	350		350
1979	317	575	892
1978	300	625	925
1977	300	610	910
Ford Motor Corp.:			
Philip Caldwell, chairman:			
1980	400		400
1979	370	522	892
1978	360	670	1,030
1977	339	615	954
Donald E. Peterson, president:			
1980	313		313
1979	229	414	643
Henry Ford II, chairman and chief executive officer:			
1979	331	320	651

TABLE 1.—EXECUTIVE SALARIES FOR U.S. AUTOMOBILE PRODUCERS, 1977-80—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Name, title, and year	Salary	Bonus	Total
1978	375	681	1,056
1977	372	620	992
J. Edward Lundy, executive vice president:			
1978	340	659	999
1977	335	610	945
Chrysler Corp.:			
Lee A. Iacocca, president:			
1980	616		616
1979	266	1,000	1,266
John J. Riccardo, chairman:			
1979	360		360
1978	343		343
1977	315	113	428
American Motors Corp.:			
Gerald C. Meyers, chairman and chief executive officer:			
1980	385		385
1979	329	360	689
1978	229	175	404
1977	160		160
W. Paul Tippet, Jr., president and chief operating officer:			
1980	285		285
1979	219	200	419
Roy D. Chapin, Jr., chairman:			
1978	211	110	321
1977	250		250

Accrued portion of \$1,500,000 awarded upon employment.

Note: Compensation does not include contingent remuneration or stock gains.

Sources: Annual Survey of Executive Compensation, business Week, May 11, 1981, p. 61; May 12, 1980, p. 60; May 14, 1979, p. 79-107

TABLE 2.—GROSS INCOME OF JAPANESE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY EXECUTIVES, 1977

Name and position	Gross income	
	In yen	In dollars
Katsuji Kawamata, chairman, Nissan Motor	91,117,000	339,356
Shoichi Saito, chairman Toyota Motor	63,781,000	237,546
Eiji Toyoda, president Toyota Motor	106,010,000	394,823
Shoichiro Toyoda, executive vice president, Toyota Motor	130,229,000	485,024
Kohei Matsuda, president, Toyo Kogyo (Mazda)	39,965,000	148,845

Note: Yen values converted to dollars at 268.5 yen per dollar. Gross income is as reported on tax returns.

Source: Tokyo Shoko Risa-chi. Zenkoku Kogaku Shotokusha Meibo. Tokyo, 1977.

TABLE 3.—INTERNATIONAL RANKING OF EXECUTIVE SALARIES, 1979

[Table also shows changes in rankings from 1974 to 1979]

Middle management 600 job unit level	Base salary in U.S. dollars 1979		Base salary in U.S. dollars 1974		Percent change in U.S. dollars 1974-79	Percent change in local currency 1974-79	Percent inflation increase dollars 1974-79 ¹	Percent change local versus U.S. dollars 1974-79	After-tax income, U.S. dollars 1974 ²	
	Rank	Amount (thousands)	Rank	Amount (thousands)					Rank	Amount
Switzerland	1	\$99.8	1	\$51.2	95	26	16	+55	1	\$66.4
Belgium	2	86.3	5	42.8	102	60	43	+26	5	48.9
Germany	3	80.4	3	46.4	73	31	23	+33	4	50.4
Brazil	4	75.5	4	45.0	68	593	405	-72	6	46.7
Netherlands	5	72.6	6	41.7	74	37	38	+27	7	41.2
France	6	71.9	7	38.9	85	74	59	+7	2	56.2
Venezuela	7	61.5	2	46.8	31	32	48	-04	3	53.1
Spain	8	52.0	12	29.1	79	112	127	-16	7	41.2
United States	9	51.4	8	35.7	44	44	46		8	39.4
Italy	10	46.9	11	31.1	51	90	99	-21	9	34.7
Mexico	11	45.1	9	34.2	32	141	131	-45	11	27.2
Canada	12	41.1	10	33.1	24	47	52	-15	10	29.2
Australia	13	40.9	13	26.7	53	81	66	-15	13	25.7
United Kingdom	14	35.9	15	20.0	80	92	102	-7	12	26.6
New Zealand	15	28.5	14	21.9	30	70	82	-23	14	16.1

¹ Based on Consumer Price Index.

² After personal income and social security taxes for family of 4.

Source: International Executive Compensation. Wharton magazine, vol. 4, winter 1980, p. 40.

¹ Corporate Chiefs' Pay: Up, Up—and Away. U.S. News and World Report, v. 90, May 18, 1981, p. 81.

² Woutat, Donald. GM Drastically Cuts Back 190,000 Workers' Benefits. Los Angeles Times, December 19, 1981, p. 1, 4-5.

³ Schwartz, Michael, and Glenn Yago. What's good for Chrysler is Bad for Us. The Nation, v. 233, Sept. 12, 1981, p. 203. Japan's Edge in Auto Costs. Business Week, Sept. 14, 1981, p. 97.

⁴ Green, Mark. Richer Than All Their Tribe. New Republic, January 6, 1982, p. 21.

⁵ International Executive Compensation. Wharton Magazine, v. 4, Winter 1980, p. 42.

H.R. 5252: HOW'S THE AIR IN YOUR STATE?

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 25, 1982, the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources, which I chair, heard testimony in Norwalk, Conn., on the administration-backed proposal to rewrite the Clean Air Act. The verdict was severe, critical and to the point: This legislation will be harmful to the environment, to the public and to the Nation's commitment to clean air.

The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection was particularly critical of the proposals to double the tailpipe emissions of carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen. It noted that 1981 automobiles already meet the standards; yet, our city of Stamford has the highest concentrations of carbon monoxide in the Nation. Moreover, existing and unhealthy levels of ozone—these experts testified—will considerably worsen under H.R. 5252.

These findings, and others like it, should be of interest to every Member in this House. Soon, we may be called upon to vote on this legislation. My advice is for each of my colleagues to ask the questions that I asked in our Connecticut hearing. Are your citizens satisfied with existing levels of pollution under the current law? Will they be satisfied with more pollution; because, this is the inevitable result from H.R. 5252.

CONNECTICUT EXPERTS SAY STATE'S AIR IS AMONG UNHEALTHIEST IN THE NATION

(By Matthew L. Wald)

NORWALK, CONN., March 25.—Connecticut has some of the unhealthiest air in the United States, and its air quality will get even worse if Congress approves the changes to the Clean Air Act favored by the Reagan Administration, according to numerous expert witnesses at a Congressional hearing here today.

Stamford's air has the highest concentration of carbon monoxide of the 48 largest cities in the nation, 29 percent higher than the concentrations found in the New York City-northeastern New Jersey area, and 18 percent higher than the levels found in Los Angeles.

These figures come from an analysis of the Administration-backed proposal by the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources of the Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee chairman is Representative Toby Moffett, Democrat of Litchfield.

Tailpipe emissions from passing vehicles have such a strong effect on Stamford that some traffic jams on the Connecticut Turnpike have "made Los Angeles look like a joke," Dr. Ralph Gofstein, Stamford's Director of Health, testified.

The Reagan Administration favors legislation to relax pollution standards for cars and stationary sources. The legislation was

offered by Representative Thomas A. Luken, Democrat of Ohio, and approved earlier this week by a subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

WOULD ADD CARBON MONOXIDE

Representative Luken's measure would allow a doubling of emissions from automobiles of carbon monoxide, which, according to testimony here by health experts, causes decreased mental and visual ability at low concentrations, and more serious effects at higher levels, including emotional instability, impaired judgment, unconsciousness and death.

State officials testified that Federal action was necessary because Connecticut, which has already spent millions of dollars to reduce pollution, receives many toxic chemicals with the air that blows in from the west.

For example, the levels of ozone—a respiratory irritant—in Hartford and Bridgeport are higher than in New York City and northeastern New Jersey, Chicago, Detroit and Baltimore, according to figures of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency.

"We'll attain the standards for ozone on most of the days when Connecticut generates and measures its own problem," said Leonard Bruckman, director of the air compliance unit of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. But he said that two thirds of the ozone measured in Fairfield County blew in from the New York City area. "We're downwind of the United States, and very much downwind of the New York metropolitan area," he said.

ACID RAIN PROBLEM CITED

The ozone problem would be made more severe by the Administration-backed proposal, experts said, because that bill would double allowable emissions of nitrogen oxides, a precursor. Nitrogen oxides are present in the air of Hartford, Bridgeport, and New Haven at levels above those found in Washington, Pittsburgh, Dallas and Cincinnati, according to E.P.A. figures.

Nitrogen oxides also cause lung irritation and decrease resistance to infection, public health authorities testified, and are a contributing factor to "acid rain," a condition that the state's Department of Environmental Protection believes will soon threaten Connecticut's lakes.

However, in the case of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and several other categories of pollutants, the relaxation is favored by a coalition of lawmakers from states with auto factories and steel mills, and where high-sulfur coal is mined or burned for electricity. Mr. Moffett called the measure "a health disaster" and repeatedly referred to it as "the dirty air bill."

Amendments to the Clean Air Act in 1977 required Congress to review the standards before the end of this year.

Under the current law, Connecticut has brought proceedings before the E.P.A. and sued in Federal court to force upwind states to comply with Federal regulations, but without success.●

THE LEGACY OF THE SOMOZA REGIME IN NICARAGUA

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the leading Nicaragua expert in the United States, Prof. Richard L. Millet of Southern Illinois University, recently wrote a paper for the State Department on the legacy of the Somoza regime in Nicaragua. This paper explains a great deal of what is happening today in that country. There is something in this balanced treatment to challenge the preconceptions of all of us. I urge my colleagues to give it their careful attention.

THE LEGACY OF THE SOMOZA REGIME

(By Richard L. Millet, Southern Illinois University)

The Somoza family dominated Nicaragua from 1936 until July, 1979. During this period the family used its political power to establish control over large areas of the national economy, amassing in the process the largest fortune in Central American history. Throughout their time in power, the Somozas constantly sought to associate themselves with the United States, creating the fixed image in Nicaragua and throughout much of the hemisphere that they were Washington's choice for running Nicaragua. As a result, the end of the dynasty has created not only major political and economic problems for Nicaragua, but has also left a bitter legacy of hostility and recrimination which plagues U.S.-Nicaraguan relations.

One of the major effects of the Somoza legacy on Nicaragua has been lack of experienced administrators available to the new government. For over forty years loyalty to the Somozas was the prime prerequisite for attaining a high governmental position in Nicaragua. This applied not only to the central administration, but also to a variety of government entities such as the Central Bank and ENALUF, the national electric company. The result has been a serious lack of administrative experience in the new regime. When combined with the rapid expansion of the government under the Sandinistas and the necessity of administering the vast economic holdings confiscated from the Somozas and their followers this has produced considerable confusion and inefficiency. In the early days of Sandinista rule leaders of the private sector and other non-Marxist groups filled some high ranking positions, providing badly needed experience, but the progressive polarization of the domestic political scene has led to the departure from government of many of these individuals.

Another Somoza legacy is a deeply ingrained mass cynicism towards government and the political process and a lack of any public tradition of subordinating individual interests to the national good. This makes it difficult for the new government to mobilize mass support for its programs.

In contrast to the tactics of such regimes as those of Trujillo in the Dominican Republic and Duvalier in Haiti, the Somozas, for most of their time in power, deliberately allowed a good deal of verbal dissent and

complaints about their regime. Even high government officials were known to joke about the corruption of the Somozas. As a result, Nicaragua has a strong tradition of complaining about government, dismissing its public statements as self-serving propaganda and believing that the prime purpose of government service is personal enrichment. This is especially true in urban sectors, where many Nicaraguans today are openly willing to voice their complaints about the Sandinistas. The significance of this complaining, however, should not be overemphasized. It is virtually a national tradition and does not signify strong support for any alternative political forces.

A related phenomenon is the tendency to blame much of Nicaragua's past and present ills on the Somozas and to identify all opposition to the current regime as "somocista." The Somozas have become virtual devil figures in Nicaraguan political mythology and are constantly invoked by the Sandinistas in efforts to discredit opposition. Examples of this are readily available. In 1980 *Barricada*, the government newspaper, ran a cropped photo purportedly showing opposition leader Alfonso Robelo and Somoza together. Sandinista rallies regularly chant such slogans as Robelo-Somoza, son la misma cosa. (Robelo and Somoza are the same thing.) Despite the obvious fact that many of the current anti-government forces are led by individuals who were active in the fight against Somoza, the government regularly attributes virtually all activities of such groups to attacks by somocistas and ex-National Guardsmen.

While the devil-image of Somoza provides the government with a constant source of propaganda, it also creates serious problems. The popular image of the former dictator as the source of all evils and the hoarder of the national wealth led to mass expectations that his fall would be followed by a rapid rise in the standard of living. This has obviously not occurred, leading to frustration and some suspicion that the new rulers are keeping much of the former dictator's wealth for themselves. While a significant psychological letdown is normal in the aftermath of almost all major social revolutions, the exaggerated image of the Somozas in Nicaraguan public perceptions probably aggravates this even more than might normally be expected.

On a more concrete level, the Somoza heritage left major social and economic problems for Nicaragua. The nation was left with the third highest rate of illiteracy in the Western Hemisphere. It also had massive health problems with a high infant mortality rate, a resurgence of malaria and a lack of basic sanitation and potable water facilities. The latter contributed greatly to the fact that gastroenteritis and other diarrhea diseases were the leading cause of death in Nicaragua. In addition, Nicaragua had Central America's highest rate of chronic alcoholism and, according to the "Guinness Book of World Records," the world's highest homicide rate.

A peculiar heritage of the Somoza years was that Nicaragua, with the lowest population density of any Central American nation (except Belize) had, at the same time, the highest percentage of urban population. Urban housing was long a major problem in Nicaragua, as in most developing nations, but the situation was made much worse by the effects of the 1972 earthquake which virtually destroyed Managua. Government reconstruction efforts, hampered by widespread corruption, concentrated on rebuild-

ing suburban areas and providing suburban-like areas for the growing middle class. Most of the downtown area remained a weed-infested wasteland, with ruined buildings continuing to stand throughout the 1970s. This peculiar landscape was seen by many observers, both foreign and domestic, as an appropriate monument to the rule of the Somoza family.

In some ways, economic growth under Somoza rule was impressive. At times, especially during the 1960s, the nation boasted the highest rate of economic growth in Latin America. Cotton, cattle and sugar all became major exports during the Somoza years. Industry also grew significantly, spurred on by the establishment of the Central American Common Market. There were, however, severe social costs for much of this growth. Land concentration increased in the Pacific lowlands where the bulk of the population was concentrated. Food production failed to keep pace with growth in other areas and the position of the small farmer probably declined in the final decades of the dynasty. 90 percent of these farmers enjoyed a per capita income of \$135 or less.

The industrial growth also was somewhat distorted. In some areas the prime purpose was to provide employment and profits for Somoza supporters and relatives. Emphasis was placed upon consumer goods and upon production of agricultural chemicals and insecticides for the rapidly expanding cultivation of export crops. Much of the new industry was high cost and inefficient, but the combination of protective measures by the Common Market and domestic policies highly favorable to their operations nevertheless insured high profit levels.

The economy was heavily dependent upon imported energy sources, foreign loans and imported raw materials for much of the industry. This, combined with growing government corruption and the financial demands of the earthquake reconstruction effort led to a deteriorating financial situation throughout the mid-1970s. Debts mounted rapidly and the deficit of the public sector grew at a corresponding rate. Inflation became a severe problem, exceeding 14% in 1974.

All of these problems were severely exacerbated by the civil conflict which led to the fall of the Somozas. During the fighting about 35,000 Nicaraguans, over 1% of the population, were killed and another 110,000 were wounded. Over 10% of the population became refugees, including nearly 100,000 who fled abroad. Over 150,000 were left homeless. By the end of the fighting a million Nicaraguans were dependent upon relief efforts for their basic necessities.

Economic damage exceeded that caused by the 1972 earthquake. Loss of plant and inventory was estimated at \$117,700,000. Industrial production fell 7% in 1978 and a staggering 32% in 1979. Several factories in the industrial zone of Managua were completely destroyed.

Agriculture also suffered. Cotton production was off 80% in 1979 and sugar and beef production also declined significantly. Slaughter of breeding stock made the decline in the latter area of special long-term significance. As a result, Nicaragua's balance of trade deteriorated still further, a situation which the Sandinistas have been unable to correct.

Finances were perhaps the area hardest hit by the internal conflict. Capital flight intensified and the cordoba had to be devalued in 1979. New loans were contracted, including a major one from the IMF, but

the proceeds were largely consumed during the conflict. In his final weeks in power, General Somoza undertook a systematic looting of what remained in the national treasury. By July 19 the Central Bank had only \$3,500,000 in reserves with which to meet \$593,700 in debts due during the rest of the year. Total debt was \$1,541,200,000, much of it in short terms high interest obligations. Without major debt refinancing the government would have gone bankrupt within a relatively short time.

The private banking sector was also devastated, contributing to the new government's rapid decision to nationalize this sector of the economy. This move added little to the government's available financial resources. As in most other domestic areas, the fiscal heritage of Somoza rule has been a major problem for the current government.

A final domestic heritage was the conversion of the National Guard, Nicaragua's combined military and police force, into a corrupt and hated instrument of personal rule. The Guard fell with Somoza, in part due to his own machinations in his last days in power, and was totally destroyed within Nicaragua. The resultant vacuum was rapidly filled by the Sandinistas whose armed supporters emerged from the civil conflict with a virtual monopoly over the organized use of force within Nicaragua.

Disastrous as the Somoza heritage has been for Nicaragua domestically, it has had perhaps equally serious effects on relations with the United States. For distinct reasons, both the Somozas and the Sandinistas had long stressed the ties between the family dynasty and the United States. As a result all the faults of his regime were associated with the United States and his final fall was widely viewed as a defeat for American influence.

To fully understand these attitudes requires some analysis of Nicaraguan history. More than any other Central American republic, Nicaragua had long been the object of direct United States involvement in its internal affairs. In the 19th century an American soldier of fortune, William Walker, actually established himself briefly as Nicaragua's "President" before being driven out by a combined Central American Army. Interest in a possible canal route kept American interest at a high level in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Even after Panama was chosen for the canal, interest remained high. In contrast to neighboring Honduras, this interest came much more from Washington than from any private company. In 1912 and again in 1926 major Marine interventions were used to put an end to civil conflicts and assure the retention of power by pro-U.S. regimes. In the latter case, the Marines remained until 1933, in part because they found themselves engaged in a bitter, prolonged guerrilla conflict against the forces of General Augusto Cesar Sandino. Sandino, who repeatedly declared that he was fighting to defend Nicaraguan sovereignty and liberate the nation from foreign invaders, was never subdued by the Marines, laying down his arms only after they had finally departed from his country.

If the 2nd intervention established the symbol of Sandino as the prime opponent of American domination it also established the ties between Washington and the Somoza family. Anastasio Somoza Garcia, founder of the dynasty, used his ties with the Americans and his command of English to rise in Nicaraguan politics during the intervention. One major effect of the Marine occupation was the replacing of all previous military

and police forces with a U.S. trained and equipped National Guard. Independent of the traditional sources of power in Nicaragua, the Guard rapidly achieved the potential to dominate internal politics. Combining his Nicaraguan political ties with his contacts with North Americans, General Somoza managed to get himself appointed as the Guard's commander when the Marines withdrew. Just over a year later, the guard murdered Sandino and Somoza began his quest for national power. In 1936 he overthrew the incumbent President, who was also his wife's uncle, then staged a carefully controlled election which brought him to the presidency. From then until 1979 the Somozas controlled Nicaragua.

From the beginning, General Somoza cultivated the image of United States support. He claimed, falsely, that the American Minister had approved the killing of Sandino. He managed to get himself invited to Washington during his first term in office and immediately began encouraging stories of his close personal friendship with President Roosevelt. The main street of the capital was renamed in honor of Roosevelt, his birthday was made a holiday, and, after his death, a huge monument was erected to him. Somoza strove to identify all of his opponents as anti-American, while, at the same time, strongly supporting in the Pan American Union and, later, in the U.N. and O.A.S., virtually every position adopted by Washington. He requested and obtained an American director for his military academy, American equipment for his troops and American aid for highway construction. He sent his sons to the United States for both secondary and higher education, with the younger, Anastasio Somoza Debayle, actually graduating from West Point. Relations cooled in the mid-1940s, especially after the General used the Guard to perpetuate his control over the government, but he skillfully used growing American fears of communism to heal the breach. When he was shot in 1956 he was flown to the Canal Zone for treatment and was attended by President Eisenhower's personal physician. All this, though, proved unavailing and he died within a few days.

His two sons took over power in Nicaragua with the elder as President and the younger commanding the military. They continued close ties with the United States, even providing the bases from which the abortive 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba was launched. The elder brother made some efforts to liberalize Somoza rule, but, following his death and his brother's "election" to the Presidency this trend was largely reversed. Anastasio Somoza Debayle continued his father's tactics, cultivating U.S. support and investments, sending his sons to the United States for education and giving unswerving support to U.S. policy along with constant attacks on his opponents as agents of communism.

Domestic disaffection with prolonged Somoza rule combined with an almost personal feud with Fidel Castro contributed to the creation of an opposition guerrilla force, the Sandinista Liberation Front (FSLN). Early FSLN efforts were easily defeated, but the group survived and maintained support, especially among student groups. The 1972 earthquake increased popular hostility towards the regime and began a period of increased FSLN power. It also strengthened the identification between the Somoza family and the United States as the U.S. Ambassador urged massive support of the government in the post-quake period. In

return, the Ambassador was praised by Somoza who opposed his recall and even placed his picture on the twenty cordoba bill.

As FSLN actions spread, Guard tactics became more brutal. The Guard was also closely linked with the United States having more of its members graduating from American service schools than those of any other Latin American army. This increased FSLN hostility towards the United States and reinforced their image of Somoza as "the last Marine," Washington's man in Managua. Efforts to disassociate the United States from the dictator began in the Ford administration and increased greatly under President Carter, but were generally too little and too late.

By the late 1970s most Nicaraguans still firmly believed that the United States made or at least approved all basic political decisions in Nicaragua and that the Somozas owed their hold on power to Washington's support. When it became obvious that the Carter administration favored a change in political leadership, upper and middle class leaders and traditional politicians began to scramble to gain Washington's approval. The failure of the 1978-79 mediation effort left them leaderless and floundering. The FSLN, on the other hand, certain that the U.S. would never support them, had built up strong domestic support and established ties throughout Latin America and Europe.

The Sandinistas constant fear and expectation was that the United States would remove Somoza and arrange a successor government excluding them. This was, indeed, the goal of Carter policy, but it failed due to a combination of policy errors and Somoza stubbornness. Till almost the end, the Nicaraguan dictator found it hard to believe that the U.S. would let the FSLN take power. When it became obvious that that would indeed happen, the last Somoza bitterly denounced the Carter administration and managed to sabotage last-minute efforts to preserve at least elements of the Guard in a post-Somoza Nicaragua.

The result of all this for present and future U.S.-Nicaraguan relations is clearly negative. The FSLN believes it came to power in spite of the U.S. and blames Washington for having created the dynasty and the Guard and for having maintained them in power. For those like Daniel and Humberto Ortega who lost a brother in fighting with the Guard, this produces genuine bitterness. The Sandinistas identification with Sandino also identifies them with an anti-American nationalism and a tendency to view Washington as the ultimate source of all national evils. Sovereignty means being independent of American influences and the worst image a Sandinista can have is that of weakness in front of the United States.

Hostility is combined with fear and even touches of what might be described as paranoia. Their own history, combined with memories of 1954 in Guatemala, 1961 in Cuba and 1965 in the Dominican Republic leads them to expect an American effort to overthrow them. Any evidence which seems to confirm this view is seized upon and magnified. They found it hard to believe that Washington let them take power and find it even harder to believe that they will be allowed to retain it. In this light, any support by the United States for internal groups critical of the regime is seen at best as an effort at subversion and at worst as preparation for a counter-revolution. In more reflective moments, many acknowledge the political and economic necessity of an ac-

commodation with Washington, but they find it difficult to believe that the Reagan administration really wants accommodation and they are emotionally much more attuned to confrontation than to compromise.

In summation, the Somoza legacy has left Nicaragua with massive internal social, economic and political problems which would be difficult to confront in the best of times. To this must be added deep-rooted suspicion and even hostility towards the United States, based on their identification of Washington with the Somozas. Standing up to Washington is at the heart of the Sandinista creed, an emotional commitment that may well be even stronger than their ties to Marxism. This makes them see a defeat for the guerrillas in El Salvador as opening the way to attacks on their rule. Every action or pronouncement by exiles in Miami or even in Central America is viewed as inspired from Washington and every American criticism of their policies is seen as part of a potential counter-revolutionary effort. Under such circumstances, direct U.S. pressures usually produce only heightened confrontation, especially when such pressures are exerted publicly. The Somoza heritage is very much alive in 1982 Nicaragua and makes all efforts at normal relations in these abnormal times much more difficult. Time may eventually heal some of the wounds on both sides, providing events within Nicaragua and beyond provide any time for patience, maturation and quiet, non-public diplomacy. ●

HEAD START PARENTS APPEAL FOR PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to get letters from Head Start parents who both testify to the ways in which this program has dramatically improved their lives and those of their children, and express their concerns about Head Start's future.

We know that Head Start works; that Head Start is cost effective. And yet, even today, it serves only 25 percent of the eligible children and faces substantial erosion from inflation and cutbacks in supportive services—CETA, title XX, child care food, Medicaid. We need to listen to the parents of Head Start children and keep this exemplary program working. Another letter from a Head Start parent follows:

HEAD START PARENTS,
West Chester, Pa.

Children today need a Head Start if we, as parents, expect our children to make the most out of life. Now is the time to do so. For many children have so much energy and want to learn. Head Start really helps them get ready for kindergarten. Thanks to the Head Start program, my child is getting that jump. It would be a shame if the early learning that Head Start offers was cut short. ●

FIRST HOME TAX CREDIT

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have joined our colleague from Georgia (Mr. JENKINS) in a bipartisan proposal to provide some short-term relief to the housing sectors.

The bill, H.R. 5948, provides the first-time homebuyer with a credit against his income tax for 9 percent of the purchase price of a home, up to \$5,400.

The bill guards against abuse by requiring the seller to certify that the sale is at the lowest figure at which it has been offered for sale, and by adding a recapture provision in the case of a sale within 3 years. The revenue loss on a static basis is, by initial calculation, \$3.78 billion spread over fiscal year 1982-83. That is a pretty good chunk of change. But it is based on the assumption that this bill will bring about 700,000 home sales in a rather short period, all to new homeowners. That may be optimistic. We have seen this year that significantly reduced rates of inflation and interest on Treasury bills have almost wiped out the all-savers certificate market, cutting our revenue losses on that item from about \$4 billion estimated, to around \$1 billion, as other tax-exempt and taxable investments became more attractive. In this case, it could be that far fewer units will move, and the revenue losses less significant.

But, if this proposal moves 700,000 units, it will produce significant offsets, and proportional offsets at lower volumes. At the very least, if 350,000 sales at \$80,000 are handled by realtors, we have got taxable commissions in the range of \$1.68 billion. If 350,000 new houses are built or sold by developers and builders, it is absolutely inevitable that wages will be paid that otherwise would not be paid. It is absolutely inevitable that a substantial number of people would receive taxable paychecks who would otherwise be getting unemployment compensation and/or public assistance. And, it is absolutely inevitable that there would be substantial nondeductible spending on paint, wallpaper, carpeting, drapes, furniture, movers, and minor items from Band-Aids and liniment to barbecue equipment; and, if State and local governments average 1 percent out of settlements, they will get about \$560 million.

I am as skeptical as anyone about the precision of "feedback" calculations. However, if taxes on commissions equal \$500 million (figuring a 30 percent marginal rate), and if the revenue

gain from all the rest equals only \$900 million—which seems to me to be low—without counting a cent of savings on unemployment benefits and public assistance, and counting \$380 million from recapture, the \$3.78 billion cost of this stimulus is reduced to \$2 billion.

Some promoting this approach will want to offset this loss with an early closing of the All Savers window. Theoretically, that would avoid a \$2.61 revenue loss between now and the end of that program. Well, frankly, and with some chagrin as the author of All Savers, I do not think we have got much more in that pot to be lost; reduced inflation and reduced T-bill interest rates have killed off All Savers as a significant revenue loser. At least today—and things may change—you can do better elsewhere. In a place where pride of authorship can cause paralysis, let me say from experience that when your pet project falls flat because interest and inflation rates fall, you can rejoice. I wish the same would happen to mortgage interest rates. In any event, with or without closing the window, the losses from All Savers that are not going to be incurred equal the net losses from this initiative.

As I said, this is one proposal on the table. There are others. There will be more. None is perfect. This may not even be the best. Those of us who are deeply committed to reviving the housing sectors must soon reach a consensus, picking one proposal or melding several. This will require putting aside pride of authorship and the "N.I.H." (for Not Invented Here) bias. Preserving the one subparagraph one labored over to write is less important than getting these sectors back on their feet.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me anticipate and answer with a rhetorical question the first argument I see coming. Some purists will raise the argument that this is a misallocation of credit. To that, one may ask, "A misallocation from what? From the construction of a franchised outlet in an Urban Enterprise Zone, financed with Industrial Revenue Bonds, written off under ACRS, owned by a conglomerate using tax benefit transfers under Safe Harbor leasing, getting an ITC, and employing workers under Targeted Jobs Credits?" If so, then it is not a misallocation of credit, but a reallocation; and a badly overdue one at that.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now to get moving on relief for the housing sectors which have traditionally led us out of recessions.●

A SALUTE TO THE PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ASSOCIATION AND ITS FOUNDER—THE LATE JANE HUNTER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to salute the Phyllis Wheatley Association in Cleveland for the yeoman's job the staff has done in the community in terms of providing essential services to senior citizens, families in crisis, the disadvantaged, and young people. In every sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, the Phyllis Wheatley Association has been the lifeline for those in need of help in the Cleveland metropolitan area.

On April 3, 1982, at the Phyllis Wheatley Association's annual meeting, the friends of the association will mark an important milestone in the history of this vital organization. Mr. Speaker, that milestone is the fact that 1982 marks the centennial birthdate of the founder of the association—the late Miss Jane Edna Hunter. In honor of that occasion, I ask my colleagues to pause and join me in a well-deserved salute to the association, its current dynamic and dedicated director, Mrs. Tommy Patty, and Dr. Adrienne Jones, who will be the guest speaker at the annual meeting.

In 1911, the Phyllis Wheatley Association was established and named by Miss Jane Edna Hunter in honor of Phyllis Wheatley, the first black woman to gain international literary fame as a poet. Mr. Speaker, just as important as her literary fame in the 1700's was the fact that Phyllis Wheatley, a slave, possessed an intense drive to overcome racial oppression and succeed.

In one of Phyllis Wheatley's poems entitled, "On Imagination," she captured the vibrant spirit and the imagination which must have been felt by Jane Edna Hunter when she conceived the idea for the association in Cleveland. A verse of that poem is as follows:

"Nor here, nor there; the roving fancy flies,
Till some lov'd object strikes her wandering eyes.

Whose silken fetters all the sense bind,
And soft captivity involves the mind."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but conclude that Jane Edna Hunter shared the need and imagination so vividly described in the aforementioned verse when she started the association. In 1911, Jane Edna Hunter followed her imagination and developed the idea to start a religious residence in Cleveland for black working girls who came to that industrial center in the midst of the "Great Migration."

Mr. Speaker, Jane Hunter must have realized the remarkable triumphs of Phyllis Wheatley, an African slave girl. It was Phyllis Wheatley who overcame the shackles of slavery to become the first black poetess in this Nation. By naming the association after this strong-willed human being, Jane Hunter used the symbolism and spirit of Phyllis Wheatley as a cornerstone in fashioning a foundation for success for black working girls in search of a better future in the North.

Mr. Speaker, the need for such a residence along with the deeply embedded philosophy of Phyllis Wheatley undoubtedly provided the relentless energy necessary for Jane Hunter to start the association. What is remarkable to me is the fact that, in addition to operating the association, Jane Hunter continued to work as a nurse for some of the more socially prominent families in the Cleveland area. All of her time, energy, and financial resources were used for the home which provided critical stability for black working women away from their homes and families.

Because of this dedication and personal sacrifice to aid others, I think that it would be appropriate to say that Jane Edna Hunter and Phyllis Wheatley were very similar in character. Both women were great visionaries. Both women rose against seemingly prohibitive circumstances to make a significant contribution to black Americans.

Today, the Phyllis Wheatley Association continues in the illustrious tradition of its founder, Jane Hunter, and its namesake, Phyllis Wheatley. The primary emphasis at the association is on helping those who cannot help themselves.

Within that context, the association has expanded its initial thrust of providing shelter and a positive environment for young women to include shelter for the city's poor, senior citizens, families, and a cadre of support services. Those services include day care for children and the elderly, musical and social development, recreational activities, and social adjustment programs for both the young and old alike.

Mr. Speaker, for example, the association has a unique housing program for families in crisis situations. The housing consists of 56 efficiency and one-bedroom units. The innovative housing program developed and operated by the association helps those families, who, because of finances or unexpected crisis, are unable to secure adequate housing.

Another integral activity of the association is the summer camp for disadvantaged young people from the inner-city area in Cleveland. Last summer, the Phyllis Wheatley Association took 282 young people in its 13 summer camp sessions in the Cuyahoga Valley

National Recreation Area. The camp is over 205 acres and has been in operation by the association since 1941. In addition to these programs, Mr. Speaker, the association has an exceptional program for senior citizens. It provides them with housing, supportive services, and other enrichment programs.

Mr. Speaker, all of these programs have made the Phyllis Wheatley Association one of the great institutions for those in need in the city of Cleveland. I know that Jane Hunter would beam with pride today if she knew of the outstanding and positive atmosphere the association provides for people in Cleveland. This is due to the vision of Jane Hunter and the inspirational philosophy of Phyllis Wheatley.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the work of the Phyllis Wheatley Association on the occasion of its annual meeting and the 100th birthday year of the late Miss Jane Edna Hunter. ●

HEALTH RESEARCH ACT OF 1982

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1982 I introduced H.R. 5919, the "Health Research Act of 1982." The legislation provides for the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA).

Our Nation's biomedical research effort is second to none in its scope and accomplishments. This effort has been encouraged by the firm and continued support of the Congress of the United States. The Congress has shown remarkable foresight in recognizing the importance of health research.

Through new discoveries, health research offers great hope for reducing enormous suffering and economic losses from illness and for improving the quality of life of the American people.

NIH has done more to expand human knowledge about the cause and prevention of disease than any other research institution in the world. As the world's foremost biomedical research institution, NIH is a Federal agency of unique distinction.

Shortly, the Congress will begin to establish priorities for the funding of Federal programs. The Congress commitment to support health research should not waiver. The discoveries resulting from these activities have enabled dramatic improvements in the quality and effectiveness of health care services. The benefits of these ac-

tivities in reducing human suffering and prolonging human life are tangible and clear.

I am confident that America's investment in health research will continue to produce generous dividends. As we look toward the future and promise of biomedical research in the 1980's, we know that the opportunities for major breakthroughs have never been greater.

Unfortunately, the administration's proposed fiscal year 1983 budget for NIH jeopardizes this future. It reduces the purchasing power of NIH by 15 percent compared with only 2 years ago. If this trend continues for the remainder of President Reagan's term, the Nation's real commitment to biomedical research will have declined by over 30 percent.

In addition, the Reagan administration's proposal will reduce Federal support for new and competing research grants by more than 20 percent compared with last year. The number of new research grants awarded will be slashed by over 1,000.

Opportunities for new discoveries will be lost. Promising scientific leads will not be pursued. Unless rejected by the Congress, these proposals will dramatically threaten the ability of NIH to carryout its basic mission.

Maintaining NIH as the world's premier and most respected research institution is and should remain a top Federal priority. It is a responsibility of this Congress that is essential to our national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the following list of the major provisions of H.R. 5919 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

1. Reauthorize the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute through fiscal year 1985.
2. Reauthorize the various Medical Library Assistance Act and the National Research Service Awards programs through fiscal year 1985.
3. Reauthorize the Medical Library Assistance Act and the National Research Service Awards programs through fiscal year 1985.
4. Establish the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the 11 national research institutes in statute.
5. Delineate the authorities of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Director of NIH.
6. Establish in statute the National Institutes of Health Advisory Board to consult and advise with respect to NIH policies.
7. Consolidate NIH reporting requirements into a single biennial report to the President and Congress.
8. Delineate the authorities of the Secretary of HHS and the Directors of the national research institutes respecting the conduct and support of research and research training, and the awarding of grants, contracts and cooperative agreements.
9. Establish in statute the advisory councils for each of the national research institutes and define the activities of the advisory councils with respect to the review of

grants, contracts in excess of \$500,000 and cooperative agreements.

10. Extend the period of support for cancer centers from 3 years to 5 years and remove a limit on annual appropriations for each cancer center and each heart, lung and blood center. Provide a separate authorization of appropriations for National Cancer Research and Demonstration Centers.

11. Require that the Director of NIH establish procedures for the review of intramural research.

12. Require appointment of an Assistant Director for Prevention at the NIH and in each of the 11 national research institutes. Require the formulation of long-range Prevention Plan.

13. Require that the Director of NIH establish a process for responding to information concerning scientific fraud and violations of the rights of human subjects.

14. Provide for a consistent set of special programs—advisory boards, research centers, data systems, etc.—for each of the arthritis, diabetes, digestive and kidney disease clusters of the National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

15. Request a report from the Institute of Medicine on the effects of commercialization on biomedical research.

16. Shift the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to the NIH.

17. Shift the National Center for Health Services Research to the NIH.

18. Require the NIH to provide assistance to scientists associated with small business with respect to preparation of applications for grants and contracts and to invite such scientists to participate on peer review committees.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

1. Delineate the authorities of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration to include administration of the alcohol, drug abuse and mental health services block grant.

2. Extend through fiscal year 1985 the authorization of appropriations for the research activities of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

3. Consolidate various alcohol and drug abuse reporting requirements into two triannual reports to the Congress.

4. Repeal the separate authorization of appropriations for alcohol and drug abuse project grants. Responsibility for conducting services demonstration projects will continue under existing research authorities.

5. Make necessary technical and conforming amendments to delineate alcohol and drug abuse authorities under title V of the Public Health Service Act.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Provide that \$3 million of the appropriations under Sections 301 and 410 of the Public Health Service Act be made available to support the National Center for Health Care Technology.

2. Reauthorize the health education and promotion programs of title XVII for fiscal years 1983 and 1984.

Mr. Speaker, an important part of the "Health Research Act of 1982" deals with the activities of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA).

I was disappointed to learn that the administration has proposed to transfer management responsibility for the

alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services block grant to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health (OASH). I believe this abrupt shift in administrative responsibility away from those Federal officials with interest in and knowledge of the substance abuse and mental health fields significantly diminishes the utility of the block grant program. The action suggests furtherance of the administration's not so hidden agenda of one day eliminating Federal support for these important services.

Accordingly, H.R. 5919 clarifies the proper role of ADAMHA within the Public Health Service and specifies as one of its responsibilities administration of the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grant program.

The legislation also extends for 3 fiscal years the authorization of appropriations for the research activities of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

In a report issued in July 1980, "Alcoholism and Alcohol-Related Problems: Opportunities for Research," the Institute of Medicine observed that "Support of alcohol-related research is disproportionately low relative to the estimated economic impact—about one-tenth of the amounts spent on heart disease or respiratory disease, and 1 one-hundredth the amount spent on cancer research, relative to the economic impact of these disorders."

The House Committee on the Budget noted in its report on alcohol research programs last year (House Report 97-158, Vol. II) concern "... about the relatively low priority given ... to support of alcohol-related research when compared to other Federal health research activities."

More recently, the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) completed an important study on the economic cost to society of alcohol, drug, and mental disorders. The RTI concluded that the combined cost to the U.S. economy of mental illness, alcohol and drug abuse was \$106 billion. Of this amount, \$49.4 billion or 46 percent is attributed to the abuse of alcohol.

H.R. 5919 reflects the 1980 recommendation of the Institute of Medicine (IOM) and the concern of the House Budget Committee. It raises the funding authorization for alcohol-related research significantly in each of the next 3 fiscal years.

I am hopeful that expansion in this important research along lines suggested by the IOM will yield significant new information on ways to better identify and treat alcoholism and alcohol-related problems. In particular, I would expect increased Federal support in such areas as psychosocial, epidemiological, and prevention research. Initiatives with respect to the prevention of drunk driving and the relationship between alcohol

abuse and other diseases should be high priorities.

The legislation also consolidates into two triannual reports a number of reporting requirements relating to alcohol and drug abuse which will highlight important research findings as well as update what is known about the economic and social costs of these seemingly intractable public health problems.

Mr. Speaker, the "Health Research Act of 1982" is a comprehensive bill which establishes health research as a high priority of this Congress. I urge each Member's support. ●

A JUSTIFIABLE BEEF ABOUT BEEF GRADING

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's effort to dilute the current beef grading standards which all of us, as consumers, rely on to purchase beef at the supermarket.

I share the concern of most consumers that this proposed change is merely a subterfuge to confuse the consumers by selling cheaper quality beef at higher prices.

I want to commend Congressmen PETER PEYSER, BERKLEY BEDELL, TOM HARKIN, and NEAL SMITH for their excellent leadership in urging the USDA to withdraw the proposed changes in beef grading. I have sent the following letter to Secretary John Block, and I urge each of my colleagues to join us in arranging that the USDA represents the best interests of the American consumer:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1982.

Hon. JOHN BLOCK,
Secretary Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C. 20250

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to express my strong opposition to proposed regulations by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which would dilute the current beef grading standards and I want to object also to USDA's decision not to publish the names of those who violate our food safety rules.

First, under the USDA proposal, the category for top-quality beef now labeled "Prime" would be broadened to include lower quality beef now labeled "Choice." Similarly, the "Choice" category would be diluted to include the lesser quality "Good" grade of beef.

Mr. Secretary, the only point to this change is to confuse the consumer who will end up paying "Prime" prices for "Choice" meat or "Choice" prices for "Good" meat. In an era of runaway meat prices in our supermarkets, that deception of the consuming public is especially inexcusable. The extra cost to the consumer of this USDA

sanctioned hoax is estimated to be \$300 million.

Since the establishment of the beef grading system in 1927, people have come to know and rely on the beef grades in making informed decisions about the relative quality and cost of meat. The downgrading of beef standards in 1976 was supposed to benefit consumers by making available greater supplies of better quality, more economically priced beef. That never happened. Instead, the downgrading undermined the integrity of the labeling and resulted in the decline of beef consumption and uncertainty about beef quality.

The mistake of 1976 should not be repeated in 1982.

This should not be an issue between consumers and cattlemen. A number of state cattlemen's associations recognize the shortsightedness of the USDA proposal and some have testified against lowering the current beef grading standards. Good businessmen realize that the cattle industry depends on reliable, honest grading systems which promote the purchase of beef both here at home and overseas.

The proposed regulation undermines the standards by leading consumers to believe that they can purchase more for less. Instead of weakening current standards, the USDA should strengthen the beef grades, while promoting lean beef as a separate grade.

Second, I am greatly disturbed at the USDA's change in policy on the publication of the names of "chronic problem" meat and poultry plants. Publication of the names of those who violate our food safety laws both acts as a deterrent to unlawful conduct and warns the consuming public of those companies not acting in our best interest. The recent report that USDA is now considering an end to systematic meat plant inspections, coupled with the reversal of the publication policy, can only leave the consumer wondering whose interest the Department of Agriculture is trying to protect the most.

Mr. Secretary, I appreciate your personal attention to these matters and I look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

DOUG WALGREN,
Member of Congress. ●

H.R. 5922 WILL RESTORE MINE SAFETY

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1981, 254 Members of the House voted for an amendment to the continuing resolution which effectively excluded most safety inspections by Federal officials at stone, sand, clay, gravel, and colloidal phosphate mines and related milling operations. I was one of those Members.

Those of us who supported that amendment were led to believe that, by restricting the use of Federal Mine Safety and Health Administration funds for such inspections, Congress was simply reducing the burden of

overzealous Federal regulators on an already safe industry.

In the months that have passed since the vote on the amendment, a great deal of counterevidence has surfaced. Many people, and I include myself in this group, have come to have second thoughts about the wisdom of the amendment. We believe that there are very real safety factors and administrative problems which have arisen as a result of the amendment. We want to undo the amendment before it results in the loss of a human life. I want to take this opportunity to review some of that evidence for the benefit of colleagues who may be unaware of it.

First, there is a great deal of evidence to prove that the affected mining operations are not safe, as supporters of the amendment were given to believe. Careful analysis of MSHA records reveals that the affected operations have higher fatality rates than other unaffected metal and non-metal mines. Between 1978 and 1980, 134 surface stone, and sand and gravel miners were killed, compared to 42 deaths in metal and nonmetal surface mines, and 53 deaths in surface coal mines. In light of stark statistics like these, it is hard to justify more lenient inspection treatment at these operations.

Second, the effect of the amendment has been to eliminate most inspection requirements at stone, sand, and gravel operations. During the debate last year, supporters were led to believe that the amendment would transfer responsibility for inspection from the Mine Safety and Health Administration to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. This is not the case. All the amendment did was to restrict the use of MSHA funds for inspections. It provided no statutory basis for the transfer of such responsibility to OSHA. Even if this transfer were to be accomplished, OSHA does not have the manpower, money, or expertise to do the job.

Third, stone, sand, and gravel operations are much more nearly akin to mining than to the construction industry. Inspecting mining operations is generally conceded to be much more difficult than inspecting construction sites. That is why Congress created MSHA. Since Congress passed the amendment last year, wide negative publicity has been given to the fact that OSHA inspectors simply do not have the necessary training and expertise to protect stone, sand, and gravel workers.

Fourth, there is a sizable segment of the affected operators who continue to support MSHA inspections of their industry. Shortly after the amendment was passed in the House last October, the president of the National Lime-stone Institute expressed his organization's opposition to eliminating

MSHA's responsibility for inspections, pending a detailed analysis from the Department of Labor on how the transfer of jurisdiction to OSHA would be accomplished.

The fifth point relates to precisely that Department of Labor analysis. While it was not generally known at the time the amendment was being considered last October, Labor Secretary Raymond J. Donovan had informed the appropriate subcommittee chairmen in both the Senate and the House that the Labor Department does not support the amendment. Secretary Donovan's evaluation is based on many of the reasons I have mentioned.

In addition, Mr. Donovan believes that many of the problems which have been experienced by sand, gravel, and stone operators can be worked out within the framework provided by MSHA. Furthermore, he feels that implementation of the amendment will cause severe administrative problems within the Department, and will necessitate the closing or curtailing of operations at 76 MSHA field offices nationwide. Once lost, the expertise in mine inspection techniques represented by hundreds of employees in these offices may never be regained.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Reagan administration in reducing the burden of Federal regulation is a clear and positive one. That record is well respected in the business community, in the labor community, and among the American people at large. Secretary Donovan and his fellow Administrators at the Department of Labor have contributed toward compiling the enviable record of this administration in eliminating regulatory excesses. That is why I view Secretary Donovan's opposition to eliminating funding for MSHA inspections of stone, gravel, and sand operations the most telling factor in my decision to change my position on the amendment I supported last year.

Those Members who share my view have a rare opportunity to undo the damage caused by passage of the amendment last year. H.R. 5922, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill scheduled for consideration on the floor soon, has been amended to restore MSHA's responsibility for inspecting stone, sand, gravel, and colloidal phosphate mines. I intend to support this provision of H.R. 5922. I will resist any effort on the floor to amend this provision. I urge my colleagues, in the interest of the safety of thousands of miners, to join with me. ●

THE "HIDE AND GO SEEK" ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, evidence appearing in this past Sunday's New York Times demonstrates that this administration is pursuing a "Hide and Go Seek" environmental policy. The administration is withholding approval of a report which demonstrates that action is required now to control acid rain. Obviously, the purpose here is to hide information which runs counter to its announced commitment to more research before it endorses an acid rain control strategy. This is particularly irresponsible given the fact that Congress is attempting to craft a useful reauthorization of the Clean Air Act this year.

The article describing this sorry incident appears below:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1982]

U.S. HOLDS UP REPORT ON GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

(By Philip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON.—The Reagan Administration is withholding approval of a report on the global environment by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development because it objects to the report's proposals for governmental action to solve such problems as acid rain.

As a result, publication of the document has been held up since late last year. The O.E.C.D., an organization of the major non-Communist industrial nations, requires approval of all members before publishing a report.

Administration officials said the report, prepared by the Secretariat of the O.E.C.D., is being strongly challenged by the United States Environmental Protection Agency on political, factual and procedural grounds, although other Federal agencies, including the State Department, the Agency for International Development and the Council on Environmental Quality, have found the report acceptable.

The report, classified as restricted by the Government, consists of working papers on such issues as acid rain, hazardous wastes, the effects of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere on climate, global loss of soil and cropland and the need to maintain the world's biological diversity. The report also calls attention to the interdependence of the ecology of nations and the increasingly recognized link between ecological factors and economic development.

The State Department official said that the environmental agency objected to the report on the ground that it did not represent the Reagan Administration's policy on international environmental matters.

"That is a somewhat premature view because the Reagan Administration still does not have an international environmental policy," the official said.

The Administration does, however, have a policy of reducing the use of governmental regulation as a means of protecting the environment. On acid rain, the Government's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

6049

position is that more research must be done before action is taken. Some authorities say acid rain is killing fresh water life and damaging crops and forests in much of the Northern Hemisphere.

The environmental agency has drafted a cable to United States missions in O.E.C.D. countries, but the State Department has not sent it. It complains that the report calls for new laws and enforced compliance procedures to deal with international environmental problems but does not give a role to "market place solutions."

The cable also objects to what it says is the report's "preponderant view that industrial progress and economic development lie in opposition to the global environment and the lessening of world poverty and hunger and that solutions are to be sought now in increased international regulation with or without adequate scientific justification."

Rather, the report seems to state that care of the environment is a requisite for economic development.

Another objection to the report cited in the cable is that it is similar to the "Global 2000 Report," a document published by the Carter Administration describing disturbing environmental and economic trends and their potential consequences. It says recent evidence invalidates many of that report's major assertions, including the finding that many species will be extinct by the end of the century.

However, the President's Council on Environmental Quality is working on follow-up actions suggested by the report. A. Alan Hill, chairman of the council, said he considered the report a "useful document."

Most Administration officials who commented on the report said they believed that Richard Funkhouser, director of international affairs for the environmental agency, had played a key role in blocking the O.E.C.D. report. ●

THE INDIAN HOUSING ACT OF 1982

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill establishing a comprehensive Indian housing program in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This legislation grew out of oversight hearings the Interior Committee held early last year on Indian housing programs and issues and it attempts to meet the fears of many Indian people about the future of Federal assistance for Indian housing needs. At my direction, the committee staff has consulted and worked with a broad spectrum of individuals and organizations interested in Indian housing for nearly a year. The end result is the legislation I am introducing today.

The United States has a special responsibility for Indian tribes and their members. This responsibility emanates from the trust relationship between Indian tribes and the United States and is grounded in the historical evolution of that relationship. As a part of the relationship and responsibility,

the United States has at least a moral responsibility to insure that Indian families are decently housed. This is even more so since States and local governments have no responsibility and provide little if any services.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has little to be proud of when we examine its record in carrying out its responsibility in the area of housing. When compared with national housing conditions, Indian housing conditions are shocking and, in many cases, would be more representative of conditions you would find in some of the developing nations of Africa or South America; 43 percent of all Indian housing units on Indian reservations are in a substandard condition as compared with 12 percent in the Nation as a whole. Seven, eight, nine, ten-member Indian families are living in two-room—not two-bedroom—two-room houses without electricity or sanitation facilities. In some cases, Indians are found living in old car bodies. Even in an era of the most extreme budgetary belt tightening, this kind of condition cannot be tolerated in America.

I cannot deny that much progress has been made in reducing the percentage of substandard Indian housing. Since the late sixties, the HUD public-assisted housing program finally became available on Indian reservations. A Federal social program designed, structured, and administered to meet the terrible housing conditions in urban areas was twisted to meet the equally terrible conditions on Indian reservations. While this attempt to adapt an urban housing program to meet Indian reservation needs left many gaps in meeting that need, it did in fact result in standard housing units being made available to Indian families. The substandard housing percentage on Indian reservations has been reduced from well over 50 percent down to 43 percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we know, the administration has asserted its firm commitment and determination to terminate the HUD public-assisted housing program and, in particular, the Indian program. A year ago, the administration proposed to rescind most of the HUD Indian housing units authorized for fiscal year 1981. We were successful here in the Congress in retaining 2,400 units.

They requested no funds in fiscal year 1982 for the Indian Health Service to provide badly needed sanitation facilities for HUD housing already constructed or under construction. Congress was successful in including some money for that purpose.

They proposed to reduce the total HUD public-assisted housing program by half and to totally eliminate the Indian program for fiscal year 1982. We were successful in including 4,000

units of Indian housing for fiscal year 1982.

This year, Mr. Speaker, they now propose to rescind the 4,000 units for fiscal year 1982 for which we fought so hard.

They are also proposing to deobligate housing units which have already been placed under program reservation in order to find money to build sanitation facilities for already constructed houses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, they propose for fiscal year 1983 a total elimination of funding for new production starts for the HUD public-assisted housing program, including the Indian program.

Mr. Speaker, I want one thing to be very clear. I am not proposing that the HUD Indian housing program be eliminated. This bill does not propose that it be eliminated. In fact, I support the continuation of the HUD public-assisted housing program. But, if the administration is successful in killing this program, there will be no housing program for Indian people.

The alternatives being offered by the administration for Indian housing are completely unrealistic and, if the impact would not be so cruel for Indians, they would be laughable.

My legislation would insure that, if the HUD program is killed, there would continue to be a Federal program of housing assistance for Indians who are completely reliant upon Federal assistance.

The bill has three basic elements. First, after recognizing the responsibility of the United States for providing assistance to Indian people to obtain safe, sanitary, and decent housing, the bill in title I, would provide a statutory basis for the existing Indian housing improvement program administered by the BIA. This program provides grants to Indian families who are at the very lowest income levels or in the most isolated or other extreme circumstances.

Title II essentially would be the replacement for the HUD Indian program, if it is terminated. It would provide Federal financing for low- and moderate-income Indian families who would be required to make some payment for their housing assistance based upon their ability to pay. This program is an Indian housing program which would provide needed flexibility which is lacking in the existing HUD program and would provide teeth and sanctions for nonpayment which is lacking in the HUD program. This program does not lock the United States into a long-term, extremely large monetary commitment like the existing HUD program. For instance, the fiscal year 1982 HUD appropriation for 4,000 units of Indian housing, if not rescinded, will lock the United States into a \$703,000,000 obligation over a 30-year period. Title II of this

bill would require a larger up-front appropriation, but would not lock the United States into long-term, exorbitant obligations.

Title III of the bill authorizes a mortgage loan guarantee for Indian families who can afford housing, but who cannot obtain housing credit because of the trust nature of their land. This title is consistent with the administration's desire to attempt to get private credit involved to meet Indian housing needs. Given the fact of extremely high interest rates and the fact that even non-Indians in rural areas have an extremely hard time in getting mortgage loans, this title may only be symbolic for now. However, we feel it should be included and that, at some future time, it may become an important part of the Indian housing program.

The bill does one further thing which is of critical importance. There is a growing criticism of the bill's provision placing the program in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The BIA has a very bad reputation among Indians with respect to their ability to administer programs and their lack of responsiveness to Indian concerns. This reputation is often deserved. However, Mr. Speaker, section 401 of title IV of the bill, coupled with the overall provisions of the bill effectively meet that criticism. The bill imposes specific requirements and restrictions on the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the administration of this program. No longer, with respect to Indian housing at least, will it have statutory authority to operate a program at its regulatory whim. There will now be a statutory basis delineating their responsibilities and a congressional direction guiding their policies. We are content that this bill will result in a model housing program to meet Indian housing needs.

Mr. Speaker, because of the budgetary deadlines the committee has to meet in reporting authorization legislation, I have not taken the time to seek many cosponsors. However, I cordially invite any Member who is concerned about the terrible conditions of Indian housing to join me on this bill. ●

THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PLAN ACT OF 1982

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the "Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan Amendments of 1982." The bill provides nondiscriminatory health benefits for all Federal employees, their families, and annuitants, and clarifies

the existing law's catastrophic coverage requirement. The bill responds to the grave concerns voiced by many Federal employees over the benefit reductions implemented by the Office of Personnel Management this year.

The 1982 Federal employees health benefits program policy authorized coverage for the mental health benefit to be cut back without regard to those Federal employees in need of treatment for mental disorders, alcoholism, or drug abuse. The Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan, which affected over 60 percent of all Federal employees, their families, and annuitants, under OPM directives, drastically altered its mental health benefits coverage. It established an arbitrary limit of 50 visits per year on all outpatient and further maintained a disparate 30-percent patient cost for outpatient mental treatment as contrasted to 20-percent copayments applied to all other outpatient health care. Moreover, it imposed an arbitrary limitation on inpatient psychiatric coverage—60 days versus 365 days for physical illness. At the same time, the alcoholism treatment benefit was completely deleted. I believe these reductions in mental benefits are extremely unwise and unfair because they:

Discriminate against one group of Federal workers; those who need treatment for nervous and mental disorder and for alcoholism and substance abuse;

Discriminate against one class of patients, as if they somehow require less insurance coverage;

Are inconsistent with the principle of insurance, which is to protect all from the exceptional, unanticipated loss; and

Are cost-ineffective because it is well documented that untreated mental illness will be more expensive than treatment in both human and economic terms.

Although the FEHB statute grants OPM discretion in its negotiations with insurers, I believe the agency must attempt as best it can to effectuate the policies of the act, including those represented by the "catastrophic" benefit provision title 5, United States Code, section 8904. Thus the bill clarifies the existing statutory mandate for catastrophic coverage for Government-wide plans, and requires all plans to pay for all medically or psychologically necessary treatments when an employee's or family's out-of-pocket expenses exceed a predetermined amount. Further, the bill would reverse the current OPM position that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to deny coverage for medical treatment to any class of patient in need of health care. It would require that all plans provide treatment for nervous and mental disorders, and treatment and rehabilitation benefits

for alcoholism and substance abuse. As you may know, the American Medical Association has often stated: "Coverage for medical care under FEHBP should not be made on a discriminatory basis based upon the nature of illness." The bill provides equal coverage and benefits regardless of the nature of the illness.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, based upon the expert testimony and factually correct evidence presented to the Congress and during recent OPM public hearings, that this unfair decrease in mental health, alcoholism and substance abuse benefits will cause Federal patients who need such treatment to enter into other inappropriate and more expensive medical treatment. There are sound economic reasons to provide coverage for mental health, alcoholism and substance abuse services. Numerous studies have shown that programs to provide employees with nervous and mental disorder consultation and treatment lead to reduced absenteeism, increased retention of experienced, talented employees, increased productivity, and reduced utilization of other health services. Often, individuals have physical problems rooted in psychiatric problems, such as bleeding ulcers, chronic migraines, and alcoholism. Moreover, inadequate coverage is ultimately more expensive for everyone, because conditions not properly or adequately treated eventually require longer and more costly care of a medical-psychological nature or hospitalization. When a person becomes ill, if not protected by adequate insurance, the financial and emotional effects on the patient and the family may be devastating. From the evidence I have seen, I believe mental illness is insurable and should be treated on an equal basis with other medical illnesses. Limiting the mental health, alcoholism and substance abuse benefits for Federal employees is the most cost-ineffective of policies.

Most important in the bill is a provision which states:

No health benefits plan shall be contracted for or approved which does not provide equal coverage and benefits (including the length, frequency, and total number of visits permitted, the duration of treatment permitted, the coinsurance ratio, the deductible, and the total amount payable to any individual in a calendar year) without regard to the nature of illness.

Already joining me in support of the bill are the American Psychiatric Association; Alcohol and Drug Problems Association; American Nurses Association; American Psychological Association; Association for the Advancement of Psychology; Health and Medical Council of Washington; National Alliance of Chairpersons of State Advisory Councils for Alcohol and Drug Abuse; National Association of Alcoholism Treatment Programs; National Association of Private Psychiatric Hos-

pitals; National Association of Social Workers; National Coalition for Adequate Alcoholism Programs; National Council on Alcoholism; National Federation of Societies for Clinical Social Workers, Inc.; National Mental Health Association; Psychiatric Institute of Washington; Psychiatric Institute of America; the Washington Area Council of Alcohol and Drug Abuse; and the Washington Psychiatric Society.

The country cannot afford to be without adequate health care plans that provide equitable care for all types of illness, physical as well as mental and emotional. I want to commend the Compensation Subcommittee Chairwoman MARY ROSE OAKAR who has already indicated forcefully her support for nondiscriminatory coverage for mental health, alcoholism, substance abuse benefits, indicating such care should be treated the same as other forms of health care.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this important effort to prevent not only arbitrary and discriminatory but also economically counterproductive cuts in mental health, alcoholism and substance abuse coverage under the FEHB program. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan Amendments of 1982".

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. Section 8902(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or discriminates against" between "excludes" and "and".

HEALTH BENEFITS

SEC. 3. The first sentence of Section 8904 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by deleting "may" and inserting "shall".

SEC. 4. Section 8904 (1) Service benefit plan and (2) Indemnity benefit plan of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of each the following:

"(G) Nervous and mental disorder benefits.

"(H) Alcoholism and substance abuse treatment and rehabilitation benefits."

SEC. 5. Insert between subsection 4 and the unnumbered paragraph of section 8904 of title 5, United States Code, the following new subsection:

"(5) No health benefits plan shall be contracted for or approved which does not provide equal coverage and benefits (including the length, frequency, and total number of visits permitted, the duration of treatment permitted, the coinsurance ratio, the deductible, and the total amount payable to any individual in a calendar year) without regard to the nature of illness."

SEC. 6. The unnumbered last paragraph of section 8904, of title 5, United States Code is amended by deleting "paragraphs (1) and (2) of" in the first sentence and inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following:

"The plans contracted for in this section shall pay all reasonable and customary ex-

penses for medically or psychologically necessary treatment incurred by the employee, annuitant or member of family in a calendar year after the employee or annuitant pays no more than \$—— per individual or \$—— per family toward such expenses."●

LET IDA NUDEL BE FREE!

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many voices raised over these past 10 years to expose the plight of one extraordinary woman, Ida Nudel, who is serving a 4-year sentence in exile in Siberia simply because she desired to emigrate to Israel.

Over the years, I have also been corresponding with yet another brave woman, Elena Fridman, who is Ida Nudel's sister and only living relative. Elena works day and night to secure justice for her sister. Her dedication and perseverance never cease to amaze me, and I dare say that she has almost singlehandedly been responsible for keeping the name of Ida Nudel in the congressional limelight and in the minds and hearts of all of us who are working to secure the release of this "Guardian Angel of Moscow."

There have been so many horrifying acts of Soviet repression against Jews and other religious believers, that this particular case could perhaps be viewed by some as yet another atrocity that we will never see resolved, because of the patently unjust policies of the Soviet regime. But, I am convinced that Ida Nudel will be victorious. She has remained strong throughout her ordeal and she has impressed so many Members of Congress with her courage and undaunted spirit during her Siberian exile, that she cannot be easily forgotten. Neither will the Soviets be allowed to forget her.

Ida has suffered enough. The banner she hung outside her apartment in 1978: "K.G.B., Give Me My Visa," is the only "crime" she can be convicted of. Yet, this act was enough to condemn her to isolation.

The torment of her sentence and years of suffering will be in vain if we do not constantly raise her case with Soviet officials. We plead that she be allowed to join her only living relative in Israel. She has certainly paid the price for speaking out against those who subvert justice and individual liberty. The time to act is now. Let Ida Nudel be free.●

HANDGUN BODY COUNT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, America witnessed the attempted assassination of President Reagan. The would-be assassin had the advantage of surprise over the Secret Service agents, by using an easily concealable handgun. Within a few seconds, four people were gravely wounded.

During the past year, I have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the monthly lists of persons killed by handguns in the United States. It has been my hope that bringing these lists to the public's attention will help stop this carnage.

Every single person from the President on down is on the handgun firing line: A handgun attack generally comes with little or no warning. The number of victims reached 698 during the month of January.

On the anniversary of the attempted assassination of President Reagan, we should reflect upon this violence and find ways to stop it.

The list follows:

HANDGUN BODY COUNT—JANUARY 1982

ALABAMA (14)

Alex Ambers, Jr., Gary Bunt, Anthony Carter, Betty Bray, Clarence Jones, Mildred Kirkland, Howard Lee, Mary McCord, Troy Martin, Cheryl Moye, Everatta Ridley, James Sewell, George Tolliver, Troy Wicker, Jr.

ARKANSAS (6)

Marill Brewer, Johnny Graham, Frank Mitchell, Jerry Stewart, William Watt, Lloyd Williams, Sr.

ARIZONA (11)

Jonathan Ferguson, William Garles, Alberto Guzman, Jeff Jones, Paul Littlejohn, Tiberiu Nestor, Leonard Peters, Marty Pincus, Willie Williams, unidentified female, unidentified male.

CALIFORNIA (80)

David Aldrete, Consul General Arian, Robin Bishop, Jamie Boyer, Nathaniel Brown, Andrea Budhanan, Brenda Burton, Fidel Cansino, Angela Castruita, Jo Chang, Dennis Cheatham, Juin Jen Chiu, James Cope, Alfredo Cruz, Denise Davis, Kenneth Ell, Julie Ellison, Steven Espinosa, Mapuna Finau, Gary Fraijo, Paula Gibbs, Jose Gomez, Ronald Green, Raymond Grenillo, George Griffith, Carlos Guerrero.

Conrad Hansen, Jerry Henager, Rosalie Henry, Richard Hernandez, Kyung Pyo Hong, Myung Lee Hong, Charles Hook, Dorris Humphries, Meshan Kesarian, Christopher Kellmer, Gerald King, David Knopoff, Willis Lancaster, Eugene Laurie, Angel Lopez, Don Luckey, Miguel Maldonado, Steven Martin, James Mathiesen, Elvie McNabb, George Minkley, Rev. Theodore Nealey, Dung Nguyen, Miguel Orozco, Congun Park, Terrie Person, Maria Polley, Mary Quick, Olegario Rivera, Robert Robertson, Wilma Rosa, Denise Siller, Cinda Southworth, Matthew Stone, David Sutton, Shelly Tellow, Roland Tong, Jose Torres.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alejandro Trejo, Helen Van Derren, Daniel Vilchis, Harold Weinlauf, Fred Wharry, Minnie Winston, Mark Zabica, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

COLORADO (12)

Savino Cordova, Gay Dixon, John Fish, Donald Haines, Sidney Jackson, Johnny Lee, Robert Phippin, Anthony Reyes, Lawrence Robinson, Lawrence Robinson III, Paul Whittaker, unidentified male.

CONNECTICUT (2)

Bernice Bruno, William Pujols.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (16)

Alton Brown, Clarence Bymum, Paul Coley, Page Fletcher, Philip Pace, Richard Patrick, William Scott, Calvin Shade, Sharon Smith, John Taylor, Michael Turner, David Wilson, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

FLORIDA (73)

Nilo Aleman, Sorrenda Alexander, Dave Ambrister, Roberto Barrios, James Bell, Maggie Benford, Eugene Berry, Heredio Contreras, Gene Corley, Marvin Crowley, Murray Ferderber, Joey Finch, John Flood, Donnie Gillis.

Francisco Gonzalez, Clayton Hope, Christ Holt, Michael Howland, Walter Humphries, Dyna Kirce, Gerald Klein, Arturo Laszlo, Lawrence Kelly, Jorge Leyva, Michael Magloire, Guadalupe Martinez, Mark Massie, Henry Montgomery, Jr., Ricky Parrish, Robert Patterson, Edward Perkins, Allan Peterson, Barbara Peterson, Gary Pollack, James Robinson.

Nilo Rodriguez, Wilma Rosa, John Ryan, Mark Rybka, Ernest Schmucker, Jozef Schoetens, Greg Scifers, Elizabeth Shulkin, Geoffrey Spiro, Peter Suder, Bruce Sulkey, Edward Threw, James Thomas, Fernando Valenzuela, Joe Warner, Nicholas Wendt, John Wenzle, John Wilkin, Dorothy Wilkinson, Carolyn Williams, Jacob Williams, James Williams, Jr., Lawrence Williams, Rachel Wilson, unidentified female, 13 unidentified males.

GEORGIA (10)

Nathaniel Brown, Freddie Burns, Gregory Crone, Janice Dismuke, Gall Findley, Mary Harrison, Floyd Minor, Mary Montague, Robert Montague, Nina Murray.

HAWAII (1)

Unidentified male.

ILLINOIS (79)

Anthony Anderson, Michael Bankhead, Wayne Bonnett, John Brooks, Jr., Frank Brown, Jr., Tammy Brown, Gregory Bunfil, Jimmy Burns, Andrew Carmody, Abraham Castillo, Trent Coleman, Gilberto Colon, Cecil Cooper, Richard Cooper, Robert Cotner, Johnny Cotton, Paul Covolo, Vanessa Covolo, Vaughn Covolo, Denise Denham, Jeffrey Genus, Gino Giolli, Walter Graf, Ephreal Green, William Greer II, Gregory Griggs.

James Harrison, Theodore Holmes, Donald Huffstatler, Phillip Inocentini, Spiro Kavathas, Jasper Kemp, Kyung Soon Kim, James Lake, Joseph Lane, John Lyon, Jim Mayer, Geoffrey Mayfield, Andre McCullum, Michael McMurtry, Kenneth Merkson, Ronald Merrit, Ever Moore, Robert Moore, Paul Morgan, Ervin Murphy, Stanley Overhill, William Paschal, Samuel Peters, Floyd Portis, Cynthia Princeton, George Prokos, Thomas Randle, Raymond Rotger, Sam Scoleri, Linda Silva, Elliott

Simmons, Everlene Smith, James Sneed, Clifton Steele, Rodger Steelman, Stanley Stinson, Mark Sudler.

Abom Taylor, Pat Taylor, John Tonjes, F. Richard Wayne, Joseph Wellner, Victor Wengel, James Williams, Eugene Wojtyslak, Brenda Woods, Sonny Woods, Sylvia Zamudio, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

INDIANA (7)

Henry Beatty, Wayman Byrd, Sr., Richard Carter, Donald Robinson, Steven Smith, Barbara Southgate, Betty Wilson.

IOWA (1)

Sonny Holtz.

KANSAS (7)

Ronnie Davis, Roland Dumont, Margaret Krom, Randy Niblick, Epimerio Otero, Shirley Otero, Randy Trimble.

KENTUCKY (1)

David Ramsey.

LOUISIANA (13)

Deborah Agy, Martin Alexander, Sam Corrent, William Eldson, Janice Elkins, John Elkins, James Haynes, Webster Johnson, Jr., Cheryl McDonald, James Plummer, Harry Walker, Donald Young, unidentified female.

MARYLAND (18)

Nancy Ayers, Charles Baker, Donald Butler, Fuller Dondson, Steven Finley, Morris Fletcher, Leonard Hagans, Jr., Willie Lloyd, Bobby Love, Olin Nelson, Phillip Pace, Arthur Phillips, Geraldine Rantz, Anthony Reddick, David Rickels, Keven Roy, Michael Turner, unidentified female.

MASSACHUSETTS (4)

Andrew Clark, Bytawtas Ivaska, Michael Lynch, unidentified male.

MICHIGAN (38)

Horace Adams, Clarence Babbitt, Oscar Barham, Beverly Braswell, Cheryl Bush, Bobby Butler, Edward Cadell, Norris Childress, Arthur Doering, Roy Eppler, Jr., Kenneth Fleck, Steve Fullard, Keith Gazda, Vernon Hankins, Jerry Harris.

Terry Hill, David Jacque, James Johnson, Melvin Johnson, Johnny Lutes, Webster McCauley, Lepolion McKinney, Thomas McLeod, Barry Milton, Alice Morgan, Lew Potchynok, Nathaniel Powell, Claude Reynolds, Lorraine Robertson, Maurice Sanford, Charles Taylor, Ann Taylor, Charles Todd, Roger Tyler, Johnathon Upshaw, Cecil Vorhis, Linda Wright, Patrick Wright.

MINNESOTA (5)

Jack Herbig, Jeffrey Hickman, Rebecca Lain, Huddley Merica, George Parks.

MISSISSIPPI (3)

Fred Jefferson, Cheryl McDonald, James Perkins.

MISSOURI (22)

John Alfred, Edgar Bell, Mary Bergman, Dennis Callaway, Donald Howard, Patricia Middleswart, Charles Mills, Kenneth Mills, Sr., Anthony Norwood, Eddie Pace, Hal Page, Walter Pearson, Odell Portwood, John Ramsbottom, Lola Skinner, Darrick Smith, Lorenzo Williams, Brenda Windsor, Richard Windsor, Thomas Winn, Paul Wirges, unidentified male.

MONTANA (1)

Harry Ostwald.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (2)

Unidentified female, unidentified male.

ana, Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas, no doubt about that. And we talk about cutting back, stretching out and delaying; yet you get a foreign aid budget that has the same kind of projects being built in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world with no cost-benefit ratio.

But even with the cutbacks, even with taking every program and squeezing it and looking at it and analyzing it, there will be economic pressure on water projects—the 117 on the budget cut, for the next three years. Count on it.

Now, many of you in this room know that I often get in trouble by being blunt and just straight-forward. I can't help it, I apologize for it, but that's my style, that is what I believe.

For the next three years, water projects in general—public works in particular and many programs across the mat—will be under severe economic pressure. How are you going to react to that? I'd say that in this crisis, our job as American citizens and as active participants in the Valley is not to say, "Let Red River proceed regardless of our economic problems." It is not to say let Red River proceed and the rest of the country be hanged because that is not what you have said. I think you've been excellent in the last years about your willingness to step back a little, to sacrifice a little, to stretch out if required, asking only that it be done fairly.

The second reason why funding is in trouble is the cost/benefit ratio—somewhere around 1.2/1.0 according to the Army Corps of Engineers. This is a marginally beneficial cost/benefit ratio compared to other projects and is the reason that the past few administrations—Democrats and Republicans—have looked carefully and negatively on full funding of the project.

You are convinced the benefits are there; after several years of intense study, I am convinced that the benefits are there. But the fact is that the powers in Washington are not convinced.

It's time, maybe past time, that our economic facts be assembled and presented in Washington. Facts which show a full accounting for the benefits of drinking water to north Louisiana and beyond. Facts which show the overwhelming benefits over costs in developing hydroelectric power. Facts which point out that the cost/benefit ratio must be computed not in the overall cost of the project but in the remaining costs. The government has already invested 25 percent of the project. The sunk costs are gone and in every other business decision in which I have participated it is the return on the next dollar spent (the return at the margin) when compared to other investment needs that determines a spend or no-spend decision.

After a great deal of study, I believe the facts of benefits including water, hydro-power, return at the margin will justify the project in comparison with all other projects and at a time in the future when the country is strong economically.

The facts will support you. Unfortunately, the facts have not been coherently presented in Washington.

A final problem given the first two I mentioned is the basic intrastate nature of the project in a state showing a budget surplus. It is clear that this administration will insist regardless of economic conditions or economic benefit facts that the state's share of participation be more clearly spelled out.

Those are three reasons why we have a funding problem: economic deficits, benefits

not understood or appreciated in Washington and the long-distance view that the state could and should do more.

The final question is what can you do about the funding problem?

(1) The real, full benefits package must be developed. You must take the lead in that effort. You can do it. No one else can or will.

(2) The state of Louisiana and its resources must become involved in funding whatever benefit studies and development are required. The state has a vested interest here and they must become intimately involved in this effort. I have met with Governor Treen in Washington this week. He tells me that the state is working and now willing to do more.

(3) The other states in the multi-state district must be made as active as possible and as visible as possible. I don't know enough to list a 1-2-3 of how that can be done, but I feel confident that you've got some ideas. Implement them; if the federal government sees little or no evidence of state involvement and coordination, then the project's chance of future funding is diminished sharply.

(4) Local and affected citizens must be informed and involved honestly and fully in the project. The solution begins here with strong fully informed local support.

(5) The congressional delegation must be made a full partner in the effort—not as blind cheerleaders regardless of national needs or benefits facts but as partners in the key decisions of strategy and as spokesmen to the Congress and the administration about the project.

Classic examples of the need for a full partnership occurred last year in a meeting with the President and in congressional debate. Because of a poor partnership relationship, many of you were not sure what I was going to tell the President or even what I said while there. A meeting before and after would have helped us all. I told the President that I would support him whatever he funded Red River, even zero, because I thought we needed to balance the budget, lower interest rates and inflation and that was the most important thing to the people I represent.

But I looked him in the eye and told him that we wanted fairness—all projects should be treated the same and, second, that we felt we could show the benefits were much better than he thought. We didn't want to be targeted but wanted a chance to develop our case.

He gave me that pledge. And although the administration did not live up to its fairness standard, the White House insists that our economic facts will be valued.

(6) Red River Valley Association is at the center of this dream and you must enlist all the help you can but take full responsibility for getting all the parties, states, local government, Washington, congressmen to work together. Better communicating, better coordination.

You have a big job and I pledge to do my part. During these very difficult and dangerous economic times, I will insist that the needs of the country come first and that will mean delay and stretch-out, sacrifice on our part for the good of America. But I will continue to insist on equity—fairness—and on a non-zero targeted hit list approach giving us the chance to make our economic case based on the facts which support the project as the nation can afford the investment.

It is a great challenge for you. I know that together we can meet it.●

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE TO HOLD HEARINGS ON CRIMINAL CODE REVISION LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker. The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, which I chair, will hold two hearings this week on H.R. 1647 and related bills, legislation to revise Federal criminal laws. The first hearing, which will focus on provisions relating to representation of witnesses before Federal grand juries, will be held on Wednesday, March 31, at 2 p.m. in 2226 Rayburn House Office Building. The following witnesses are scheduled to testify: Charles F. C. Ruff, former Watergate Special Prosecutor and U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia; Hon. Tom Foley, county attorney for Ramsey County, Minneapolis; Prof. Peter Arenella, Rutgers University School of Law; Linda Backiel, Esq., on behalf of the grand jury project of the National Lawyer's Guild.

The second hearing, which will focus on the sex offense provisions of the legislation, will be held on Thursday, April 1, at 1 p.m. in 2237 Rayburn House Office Building. The following witnesses are scheduled to testify: Representative STENY HOYER; Bruce Bereano, member of the Maryland Commission on Women and recently appointed to Maryland's Advisory Board on Rape and Sexual Offenses; Hon. Norman Early, Jr., chief deputy district attorney, Denver, Colo., and member of the board of directors of the National Organization for Victims Assistance; Leigh Bienen, Esq.; Prof. Jeanne C. Marsh of the University of Chicago; and Prof. David Finkelhor of the University of New Hampshire.●

KNELL MORTUARY OBSERVES 100TH YEAR

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, few families in America have contributed more to their community in public service and civic participation, than have the Knells of Carthage, Mo.

For three generations, the family has operated the Knell Mortuary in Carthage and this year will mark its 100th anniversary of service to the community.

The business was founded by Edward Knell in 1882. Upon his death, he was succeeded by his son, Frank.

When Frank passed away in 1943, Miss Emma Knell, the third woman in the State of Missouri to be licensed as an embalmer, headed the firm until 1949. Since that time, the mortuary has been operated by the founder's grandsons, Frank W. Knell, Jr., and Robert Knell. Mrs. Lucy Knell Buckwell joined the family business in 1921 and the founder's eldest son, Fred, also worked in the firm.

It has been a pleasure to know and have the friendship of such an outstanding family. They have worked tirelessly in their business as well as in community affairs, being responsible for the founding of the Carthage Merchants Association, a forerunner to the chamber of commerce and the creation of the Jasper County Fair.

Recently, the Carthage Press carried a story detailing the growth of the family business.

The article follows:

[From the Carthage (Mo.) Press, Feb. 16, 1982]

KNELL MORTUARY OBSERVES 100TH YEAR

The Knell Mortuary, now in its 100th year of service, is operated by third generation members of the pioneer family.

Edward Knell, founder of the organization, was born in Bayfield, Canada, but went to Switzerland with his parents, the late Mr. and Mrs. Fred Knell when he was 10 years old. He studied in Switzerland and in France before going to Davenport, Iowa, to make his home with a brother who operated an upholstery business there.

After learning more about the business in Chicago, Ill., and Cincinnati, Ohio, he returned to Davenport where he joined his brother's firm as manager of a branch shop in Moline, Ill.

Because of the extremely cold winters in Illinois, Knell decided to move south. He came to Carthage in 1882 and purchased the furniture and undertaking business of Hurley and Dingle, on the south side of the Carthage Square in the Burlingame Building. He had a partner in the business, George C. Howenstein. After two years, Knell sold the furniture business to his partner so he could devote his full time to the funeral business.

Edward Knell's ideals were to give the best service to the family and treat a body with respect and dignity. In those days, the undertaker only carried coffins. Families selected the lining, pillows and handles that went on the coffin.

When E. Knell came to Carthage, the only method used to keep a body longer than one day was to ice it down in a large zinc-lined box until the morning of the funeral when it was dressed hurriedly and placed in the casket. It was then taken to the private home of the deceased.

To E. Knell there was something sacred about death. He gave much thought to the advancement of methods which would make it possible to take care of the dead in a manner which would relieve as much as possible any horror of death.

To accomplish this plan he entered the Clark School of Embalming in Cincinnati, Ohio. On March 17, 1887, he received his diploma from that school. The diploma still hangs in the offices of the mortuary. Knell was the first to introduce the art of embalming in Jasper County. He continued to gain all possible knowledge about his chosen

profession. He was one of the first embalmers in Missouri to successfully pass the test by the State Board of Embalming and to obtain a license to practice embalming. His license was number 7 and was granted Aug. 12, 1895.

One of his dreams was to have a modern funeral establishment. This was to be realized in 1907 when the business was moved into the Knell Building at 201 E. Third Street. The two-story building was 35 x 50 feet with a full finished basement and was first undertaking parlor in southwest Missouri. In 1908 a third story was added to the building and an addition on the north side was completed in 1910. Knell realized his dream by finishing the first chapel in the county.

E. Knell was a lover of horses and maintained The Knell Driving Park at his farm at the west edge of Carthage. There he built a park and in 1902 started the Knell Fair.

Using his own funds, along with borrowed money, he built the huge grandstand with a one-half mile track. There harness races were held and later some auto races.

He was quite proud of his horses. One of the horses named Early Reaper held the record on the Missouri State Fair track at Sedalia for over 50 years.

The first year the Knell Fair just broke even but during the next few years it prospered and it was impossible for one man to handle it. A board was established and the name was changed to the Jasper County Fair. In 1909 he was succeeded by his daughter Miss Emma Knell as secretary and general manager. Under her guidance the fair grew to be the second largest in Missouri State Fair. Miss Emma continued in that capacity until 1926 when she resigned to serve in the Missouri Legislature.

E. Knell also was a community leader. He founded The Carthage Merchants Association, a forerunner of the Carthage Chamber of Commerce. He also established a trust fund to start the free-bed fund for indigents at the Carthage Hospital.

All four of Knell's children became active in the family business. Knell had always wanted to have a woman in the business to assist with the women and children. His daughter Miss Emma Knell was graduated from Carthage High School in 1877 and she went to St. Louis to attend the National School of Embalming. She received her diploma and later passed the state board of embalming examination in 1887 and received license No. 391.

She was the first unmarried woman and third woman in Missouri to be licensed as an embalmer.

The eldest son, Fred E. Knell served as a member of the firm until about 1917 when his health failed. He died Feb. 11, 1921. He was the father of Ed Knell, well known farmer northeast of Carthage.

Frank W. Knell, Sr., father of the present owners was graduated from National School of Embalming in 1904, and that same year obtained embalmer's license 814. Knell served 14 years on Carthage board of Education and was one of the original boosters to bring professional baseball to Carthage in 1937. He also was active in all community affairs.

Another daughter Miss Lucy Knell Buckwell returned to Carthage in 1921. She passed the state board that year and received license No. 2510. They are the only women in Carthage to have held embalmers licenses. Lucy died Dec. 1, 1973.

On March 31, 1943, Frank W. Knell Sr. died. At that time his sons Frank Jr. and

Robert joined the family business, making the third generation of Knells to serve the community. Both Frank and Robert are graduates of Carthage High School, University of Missouri and St. Louis College of Mortuary Science. Both were graduated with distinguished honors. They also have taken various courses at the National Foundation of Funeral Service in Evanston, Ill. Both also hold Kansas licenses.

The Knell family is proud of its staff. A veteran employee James Canady, who died in Feb. 27, 1947, was a member of the staff 35 years. Lee Thompson, 527 Olive St., has been a member of the staff nearly 40 years.

In 1948 Mrs. Lucy Knell Buckwell sold her interest to her nephews Frank and Robert, and a year later they purchased the interest of Miss Emma. Miss Emma remained a member of the staff on a consulting basis until her death Sept. 19, 1963.

The Knell Mortuary is proud of its membership in the National Selected Morticians. This is the Phi Beta Kappa of funeral service. Membership is by invitation only after a rigid examination and the firm must maintain the rigid requirements. Only 35 firms in Missouri have been qualified for this membership. Both Frank and Robert have been active in Missouri Funeral Directors Association. Frank served as its president in 1957, the youngest person to ever hold the office. Robert served as president in 1968-69. E. Knell helped organize the association. The firm has maintained membership in this organization for nearly a century.

The younger members of staff include Rob, who represents the fourth generation. Robert is a graduate of Carthage Senior High School. He attended Missouri Southern State College and was graduated from the Dallas Institute of Mortuary Science. Rob holds embalmers license 5687.

Neel Baucom, son-in-law of Frank Knell, was graduated from Carthage Senior High School, Missouri Southern State College, and the Dallas Institute of Mortuary Science as valedictorian of his class. He holds embalmers license 5898. All are licensed funeral directors. Frank holds license No. 7, which incidentally is the same number of embalming license of his grandfather. Robert holds license No. 8. Dorothy Knell, wife of Frank, holds funeral director license 763, and Doris, wife of Robert, license 764. Rob has funeral director license 3486 and Neel 3552. Lee Thompson also is a funeral director and holds license No. 747.

The Knell family has handled services for 17,432 persons in the 100 years. This family owned and only locally owned service in Carthage is proud of the confidence the public has placed in them and hope to continue to merit that confidence.

The busiest time they had during the past 40 years, Frank Knell said, was 17 services pending, seven were scheduled in one day.

In 1954, the Knell Mortuary was completely remodeled and today is one of the largest mortuaries in the Four-State area. At that time, the two original homes were joined together. The west building contains the chapel, which seats 175 at full capacity. A large family room with a private entrance from the parking lot will seat 65. An entrance foyer, music room and a hall to the center portion, together with a live room apartment upstairs are also in this part of the building.●

THE IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1982

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 along with my distinguished colleagues Congressmen ROBERT MCCLORY and HAMILTON FISH, I introduced H.R. 5872, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. Senator ALAN SIMPSON, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

I have been extremely gratified by the responses to this bill. People have written to me from throughout the country urging quick action on this legislation, which is so important if we are to gain control of our Nation's immigration policy. A large number of my colleagues have approached me on the floor indicating their support for this bill.

I am also pleased that various major newspapers around the country, recognizing the importance of our immigration problem, have offered support for the Simpson/Mazzoli bill. I insert the editorial in support of the bill; from my home town newspaper, the Louisville Courier Journal, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Mar. 20, 1982]

MAZZOLI'S IMMIGRATION BILL RECOGNIZES JOBS ARE THE ISSUE

The immigration bill introduced Wednesday by Congressman Romano Mazzoli of Louisville and Senator Alan Simpson of Wyoming already is stirring up controversy. But it is controversial precisely because it addresses a key immigration issue that Congress has irresponsibly avoided until now: employment of illegal aliens.

So long as U.S. employers can safely hire workers who come to this country illegally, the flood of such persons—now estimated at 500,000 a year—will continue unabated or even increase. Border patrols and airport checks by the Immigration and Naturalization Service cannot begin to cope with the problem unless they are massively expanded, at enormous cost and the risk of police-state abuses.

Jobs, more than anything else, are the magnet that makes the United States so attractive to millions in Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean and beyond. But the U.S. economy no longer is generating jobs fast enough even for those already in this country. So unrestricted immigration, which is a fact if not official policy in America, is rapidly becoming a source of social, political and ethnic strife.

The Mazzoli-Simpson bill would tackle the problem by making it a crime for U.S. employers knowingly to hire illegal aliens. The question that immediately arises, of course, is how an employer is to know that a job applicant is in this country illegally. As an interim solution, the bill would require employers to check would-be workers' identification papers, such as Social Security cards and drivers' licenses.

Because these documents can easily be forged, the bill also calls for the president to develop a more effective verification system within three years. This aspect of the bill is sure to worry civil libertarians who foresee national identification papers or internal passports of the sort that citizens in many European countries must carry.

Most Americans would rightly object to such an intrusive requirement. But a system doubtless could be devised under which Social Security cards are made reasonably tamper-proof and employers could determine, with only a phone call, that a Social Security number matches a job applicant's name and age. As a further guard against unwarranted intrusion, the law could specify that the cards need be shown only to prospective employers.

Besides the penalties for hiring illegal aliens, which are opposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Mazzoli-Simpson bill also would set a yearly immigration ceiling of 425,000 persons, exclusive of political refugees. This is about the current level of legal immigration, and the bill would allot 60,000 of these slots to Mexico and Canada. Because relatively few Canadians are expected to immigrate, this provision likely would have the effect of increasing legal immigration from Mexico, now 20,000 a year.

This is preferable to the Reagan administration's proposed "guest worker" program under which as many as 50,000 Mexicans would be allowed into the country for a year to seek jobs. With the Immigration and Naturalization Service already overburdened, it would be difficult for the government to assure that these workers returned to Mexico when their year was up.

In all likelihood, they would join the estimated 3.5 to 6 million illegal aliens already in the U.S. That figure would be substantially reduced, under the Mazzoli-Simpson bill, by an amnesty process under which illegal aliens who have been here since at least 1978 could receive legal status. The amnesty provision is a concession to human reality. Rounding up and deporting millions of people, even if it were possible, would be a brutal business.

Better by far to gain control of future immigration. Congressman Mazzoli and Senator Simpson deserve credit for producing a plan that would do just that. Those who complain that it isn't perfect should be asked just what they would do to stem the tide of illegal immigration. And those who say there's no problem just haven't been paying attention.●

DO NOT FORCE MILLIONS OF SENIORS INTO POVERTY—DO NOT CUT SOCIAL SECURITY COLA'S

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a number of Democratic and Republican congressional leaders have recommended reducing or deferring the scheduled cost-of-living adjustments for social security recipients as part of their deficit-reducing packages. I oppose these proposals and yesterday introduced House Concurrent

Resolution 298 which expresses the commitment of the Congress to maintain this vital inflation protection for retirees.

Seniors have already been devastated by cuts in all their necessities—food, rent, health care, and energy assistance. Further cuts would jeopardize the lives of many older Americans. According to a recent study reported in yesterday's Washington Post by Data Resources, Inc., the COLA cutbacks would have devastating results for many elderly persons: Up to 1.2 million elderly people would be pushed below the Government's official poverty line by 1985, and 2.1 million by 1990.

Public confidence in the social security system is at an all-time low. Proposals to cut the cost-of-living adjustments add to the public's concern and skepticism about the program and Congress willingness to provide promised benefits. I am getting a great many letters and phone calls from seniors worried about the proposed COLA cutbacks. During the Easter recess we will be seeing many others looking for reassurance that Congress will not cut back their social security benefits. We must act quickly to assure American workers and retirees that Congress will not make older Americans the scapegoats of the budget battle.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the resolution which is printed below:

H. CON. RES. 298

Whereas existing law provides for annual cost-of-living adjustments to help protect the income of 36 million social security recipients from the devastating impact of inflation; and

Whereas other benefits providing for the necessities of life to older Americans already have been drastically reduced, including Medicare, food stamps, Medicaid, subsidized housing, and low-income energy assistance; and

Whereas the reduction or deferment of scheduled cost-of-living adjustments would be tantamount to a cut in social security benefits and inconsistent with past bipartisan efforts to provide inflation protection to social security recipients; and

Whereas cuts in scheduled cost-of-living adjustments would further undermine public confidence in the social security system; now: Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, it is the sense of the Congress that no cuts should be made in cost-of-living adjustments under title II of the Social Security Act.●

A "NEW BEGINNING" CREATES "NEW POOR" IN LORAIN COUNTY

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday's Washington Post carried a very troubling article about the economic suffering in my district—the 13th Congressional District of Ohio. I remember how President Reagan, then candidate Reagan, promised all of us a "new beginning" when he accepted the nomination of the Republican Party to campaign for the Presidency in the summer of 1980.

Now the terrible truth is apparent and no amount of Saturday radio shows will hide it. The President's economic program has brought us to the brink of economic disaster. I urge my colleagues to review the following article in order to more fully appreciate the hardship and anguish brought to millions of hardworking Americans who have sacrificed their jobs to the folly of Reaganomics.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1982]

JOB LAYOFFS CREATING THE "NEW POOR"

(By Warren Brown)

LORAIN, OHIO. Trickle-down unemployment has saturated this industrial town, located at the mouth of the Black River on the shore of Lake Eire.

Because the huge Ford Motor Co. plant here can't sell enough of its Thunderbirds and Cougar XR-7s, auto worker Ronnie Chambers, 34, is jobless.

Because oil prices have dropped and oil companies no longer need as many of the seamless pipes made by the Lorain-Cuyahoga Works of U.S. Steel Corp., steel hands William Socotch, 58, and George McKenzie, 59, are out of work.

Because Chambers and Socotch and McKenzie and about 20,000 others in this once booming manufacturing center can't find jobs, Bonnie North, 26, an unemployed billing clerk, can't find one, either.

"Where do you go for work? Anyplace except Lorain, that's for certain," said Bob Zelina, director of Lorain County Labor Agency, Inc., a union-run outfit that provides credit counseling, job searches and other services for union and nonunion workers.

Lorain is one of many places in this state hit by the high unemployment that also has hit towns and counties in Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania and other places where heavy industry, once robust, has been weakened by high interest rates and falling sales and a continuing shift to a more service-oriented economy.

Where do you go for work in a time and place like this—where the new cars are being turned out more slowly and the steel blast furnaces are cooling and the people down at the AmShip Division of the American Shipbuilding Co. aren't building many ships anymore?

Bonnie North went to local stores and shopping centers, to doctors' and lawyers' offices and to other places where people normally spend money. But not many are

spending much in this town of 74,000 people, nor elsewhere in Lorain County, which has a population of about 273,000. So no one hired her.

North remembers President Reagan's recent recommendation that people stuck in jobless regions "vote with their feet." She would like to do that, move someplace where there are more jobs than job hunters, she said. But that would mean leaving her 62-year-old mother, Alice, who has been in the Lorain Community Hospital for a month with a serious intestinal illness.

"My mother is not well. She can't move away from here, and I'm not leaving her," said North, who is a devout Jehovah's Witness.

Many people in this city and county believe they're in a depression, and they say they have the figures to prove it.

The official unemployment rate for the Lorain area was 17½ percent last December. It dropped to 15.2 percent in January. But the area's municipal and civil leaders say the drop is deceptive.

"A basic reason for the rate decline is that about 3,000 people in the area dropped out of the work force between December and January," said Reid Kollins, director of the Greater Lorain Chamber of Commerce.

"Nobody really knows where they went. But I'm sure a lot of them must still be around. I know they didn't all pack up to go back to West Virginia or someplace."

Lorain is a proud community, its residents accustomed to rising early and working late. Even now, with jobs scarce, predawn traffic moves briskly along state Route 57, an artery through the center of town.

Ronnie Chambers and his 32-year-old wife, Wilma, usually are in the early morning traffic. He drives their 1978 Ford LTD 29 miles west to Cleveland, where Wilma Chambers earns \$125 a week working in a nursing home. Chambers drops off his wife and then drives to his parents' home in Cleveland, where he leaves his youngest of three daughters, 5-year-old Rhonda, for the day.

Chambers then goes to "work"—looking for a job. He might go to the nearby towns of Sandusky or Medina, or Avon or Elyria. But he is a spot welder in a land of unemployed or robotic spot welders, and no one is hiring.

"I was thinking about leaving here altogether and going down to the Sun Belt. But everybody I know of who did that came back saying it wasn't much different there, and that if you found a job, you most likely couldn't find a house you could afford. I don't know if I want to take that chance with my wife and girls," Chambers said.

Meanwhile, the job search continues. "Maybe I'll find something," Chambers said, forcing a smile and rubbing his bad hand, which was mashed in a steel mill accident back in Detroit. But he couldn't hide the worry.

Chambers has been irregularly employed since 1979, when the domestic auto industry began running on empty. At first, he got \$115 a week in state unemployment benefits, and matched that with \$164 in weekly federal trade readjustment assistance (TRA). The aid was given to U.S. workers whose jobs the government judged to be imperiled by foreign compensation.

Chambers said he "could care less" about politics. He didn't care "one way or the other" when Ronald Reagan was elected president in 1980. "I didn't vote. I never vote," he said.

The Reagan administration virtually eliminated TRA, and Chambers' benefits

from that fund dropped to \$2 a week before disappearing altogether. He will exhaust his extended unemployment benefits in April, leaving Mrs. Chambers' weekly check to take care of the family's needs.

The couple has taken some steps to soften that expected blow. They have sold their pickup truck and moved to a small house here that rents for \$210 a month, \$30 dollars less than their previous house. Because of a \$50-a-week gasoline bill, they stay home when Ronnie Chambers is not looking for a job or driving his wife, who can't drive, back and forth to her job in Cleveland.

Chambers has a sister and brother-in-law who work for General Motors in Detroit. He used to get loans from them. But they have been hearing rumors that they, too, will be laid off. Understandably, their willingness to make additional loans has diminished, Chambers said.

"I don't know how we're going to survive if the jobs don't come back," he said.

Chambers is not angry with Reagan, though. "I don't blame anybody for this situation. I don't know who to blame. All I want to do is find a job," he said.

Chambers said he has heard "the talk that the economy is going to come around," maybe by summer. "But I wonder how in the hell we're going to survive while we're waiting," he said.

Some of those who have survived have suffered grave psychic wounds. They are among those who show up at the Lorain County Community Action Agency, an independently run social aid organization located in a gray building at 3553 Broadway here. The reception room is small and crowded with people, black and white; men and women, young and old.

It is a curious crowd. Some have been in the room before, many times, and have become experts at filling out aid request forms and working the system. Others are what agency Director Charles Hopkins calls "the new poor"—people, often white, who have tumbled from the assembly lines, the steady, good-paying jobs and the comfortable homes in some of Lorain's nicer neighborhoods.

The "new poor" don't talk much, not in crowded rooms, anyway. Hopkins is their spokesman.

"I've been in the poverty movement for 17 years, and I haven't seen it this bad," he said. "Traditionally we say the chronic poor, the people who have been on welfare for generations."

"But now, we're seeing people who have been making at least \$25,000 a year . . . It's a real strain on them to have to come in here," Hopkins said. He said many of the "new poor" are so ashamed of their status, they actually wait until foreclosure or eviction, or until their utilities have been shut off, before coming to the agency.

"I've seen people cry in here. I've seen men and women cry . . . I've seen them go into rages because they had to fill out forms and answer the kinds of personal questions they've never had to answer before. They're ashamed of being on public assistance. They're in shock. They're just not used to it," Hopkins said.

Statistic: Since Jan. 1, the agency has granted emergency heating assistance to 1,300 applicants. Fifty percent of those were members of the "new poor," Hopkins said.

"People ask you how you feel about this," said William Socotch, the laid-off steelworker, preparing to go to the local unemployment office to file a claim. "Well, how would you feel? How is a man supposed to feel?"

"You invest a lot of time in a job. You're a good worker. But yet, you're out. They lay you off or they close the plant down."

"I'll tell you how I feel about going to stand in that damned unemployment line. I don't want to be there. I don't like it one damned bit. It's a slam against my ego."

To George McKenzie, working at the steel plant was just a way to supplement his real job—"my work for the Lord," McKenzie is an assistant pastor at the Third Baptist Church of Lorain. "And the Lord will take care of it," he said about his current jobless plight.

But a devilish smile crept across his face when he said this. "You know," he began, "not even the Lord wants me to sit here and try to make it on unemployment. If I don't get my job back at the plant, or if I can't find another job around here, I'm going to move."

"I've been in Lorain most of my life. I'm 59. But I'll move if I have to. I have a family. They got to eat."

"The Lord is going to take care of it. But I can't just sit around here on my little skinny butt and wait for him to do that," McKenzie said.

It is nearly 4:30 p.m. on a Wednesday. Joseph F. Koziura, Lorain's elected city auditor, has just gotten the news. U.S. Steel is going to lay off another 600 workers, bringing to 1,800 the number laid off since the start of the year. The plant normally has over 5,000 employees. The latest layoffs mean Lorain will lose an additional \$125,000 in annual payroll taxes. Altogether, with nearly 2,000 furloughed from the plant, the city will lose \$425,000 a year.

"We could lose triple that amount with the ripple effect, with reduced commercial sales and that sort of thing," Koziura said. Partly for that reason, and because the city is in need of major capital improvements, Koziura, a Democrat, is proposing a local income tax increase and several new public service fees.

"Crazy? No, I'm not crazy," Koziura said. "This city has an A-1 credit rating with Moody's. We're not going to default on any obligations and lose that. That would be throwing away the future."

Koziura, a dapper man of 36, has been in office 11 years. He candidly admits higher political ambition, to preside over Lorain as mayor, bringing it back to industrial greatness.

He said he wants to do this by diversifying Lorain's economic base, by bringing in small, high-tech firms that would employ no more than 300 people in a given shop. There also is the promise of Lake Erie, a major waterway that Koziura believes has not been fully exploited.

"We'll get through this," he said, referring to the latest news from the steel company. "This town is still very much alive."

JACK GALLAGHER, A WINNING BASKETBALL COACH

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in Pennsylvania we have just lost one of our most knowledgeable and most successful basketball coaches, John E. "Jack" Gallagher who died on March 4.

Jack Gallagher was a resident of my congressional district, and it was my privilege to know him and his influence on countless young men and women whom he coached at Scranton Prep, at St. Paul's High Schools, and in numerous basketball clinics. He was an outstanding man, a devoted father, and extraordinarily accomplished teacher and coach, and an inspiration to so many students.

"Gallagher's reputation as a highly informed basketball coach was known throughout the East," as the Scranton Tribune said in its obituary printed on March 5, 1982. For that reason, I insert the Tribune article in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Tribune, Scranton, Pa., Mar. 5, 1982]

JOHN GALLAGHER, COACHING GREAT

John E. "Jack" Gallagher, one of the most successful coaches in the annals of area scholastic basketball, died Thursday in Mercy Hospital, the victim of an apparent heart attack.

Gallagher, recognized as one of the most knowledgeable basketball men in the state, compiled a record of 238 wins and 68 losses while coaching at Scranton Prep from 1953 to 1968.

It was reported the retired coach suffered a heart attack in his home at 1302 Green Ridge St. and was rushed to Mercy Hospital where he underwent surgery.

A Dunmore native, Gallagher's reputation as a highly informed basketball coach was known throughout the East. He served on the staff at Camp All-America at Cornwall-on-the-Hudson for a number of years and had discussed various aspects of the game with many of the country's top college and high school basketball coaches. Over the years he conducted numerous clinics particularly for boys on the high school level.

Gallagher was graduated from Dunmore High School in February, 1937, and served 42 months in the Army. He graduated from East Stroudsburg State College in 1951 with a bachelor of science degree in health and physical education.

He began his coaching year in the 1951-52 season at St. Paul High School, Green Ridge, while employed as a home-bound teacher in the Dunmore School District.

The following year he took over at Prep and compiled a 20-7 record while capturing his first of nine Catholic Basketball League championships. He never finished below fourth place in the league and never experienced a losing season in basketball at Prep.

In the years he didn't win a CBL crown his team finished second three times, third once and fourth once.

While at Prep, he twice led the Cavaliers into the PCIAA Class A basketball finals, once with a team that finished the season with only a 13-8 record. The Cavaliers under Gallagher also won three Lynett Tournament championships.

Gallagher left the coaching position at Prep in January of 1967 and began scouting for Army basketball coach Bobby Knight.

In 1969 he was back on local courts as coach of Pittston Area but resigned in 1974.

Since that time, he has been scouting for Knight, who now is coach of the University of Indiana team which captured the 1981 NCAA championship.

Gallagher was married to the former Jennie Russoniello, who was a standout

player with the famed Bucktown Girls. Also, surviving is a daughter, Chris.

Funeral arrangements are being handled by the Vanston Funeral Home and are incomplete. ●

NO QUESTION OF PRIORITIES

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 5977, the Energy Equity Act. This legislation would impose upon recipients of Synthetic Fuels Corporation assistance the obligation to contribute "earnest money" equivalent to 20 percent of the Federal assistance received into an energy equity account. The Energy Equity Act would terminate the SFC at the end of phase I of the original synthetic fuels program on September 30, 1984.

The funding authority remaining to be obligated by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation under phase I is nearly \$15 billion. If all of this amount is awarded to SFC assistance applicants, \$3 billion would be deposited in the energy equity fund. Two-thirds of this amount is to be used for low-income energy assistance and weatherization; the remaining third would be used to assist our depressed housing industry. Half of any funds not awarded by the SFC will also go into the energy equity account.

In the past week, we have seen that the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, inherited by this administration, is a turkey this country cannot afford. Despite the best efforts of Chairman Noble and the directors and staff of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation to make this program more than a subsidy for the R. & D. departments of the major oil companies, the March 24 Wall Street Journal and March 30 Washington Post articles I am inserting in the RECORD describe cost overruns of \$1.8 billion for the Colony Shale Oil project sponsored by Tosco and Exxon. When you consider that the \$1.2 billion Government loan guarantee granted to Chrysler was the largest Government loan guarantee ever approved for a corporation, the magnitude of this overrun is plain.

To continue funding such projects, and sponsors like Ashland, Tenneco, Dynallectron, and Bechtel, while the energy consumers of this country receive reduced aid and assistance to heat and weatherize their homes, and the American dream of homeownership is almost a forlorn hope for most of the young people in this country is worse than foolish—it is unconscionable.

I hope my colleagues will join with those of us who have introduced this legislation to secure the quickest possible consideration and passage of the Energy Equity Act.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1982]
COST OVERRUNS ON SYNFUELS PROJECT CITED
(By Martha M. Hamilton)

The company holding a \$1.1 billion synfuel project government loan guarantee for one of the nation's largest synfuels projects has limited understanding and no control over project costs, according to reports prepared for the Department of Energy.

The reports, prepared last month, describe the design of the Tosco-Exxon Colony Shale Oil Project as much sketchier than it was said to be when the government approved the loan guarantee for The Oil Shale Corporation, a Tosco subsidiary. Cost estimates, based on the project design, have been escalating upward, raising questions about Tosco's ability to finance cost overruns.

The loan guarantee is almost as large as the \$1.2 billion government loan guarantee granted Chrysler, the largest government guarantee ever approved for a corporation.

The government's Synthetic Fuels Corporation is already facing considerable opposition in Congress where a bill was introduced yesterday to take away most of its authorized funding and another bill has been introduced to disband it. The SFC's difficulties are likely to be compounded by its problems with this loan guarantee.

"Although Tosco put many years and many millions of dollars into developing the most advanced oil shale project in the country, it is clear now that even this sizable investment did not guarantee reasonable certainty of costs or design," Rep. Toby Moffett (D-Conn.), chairman of the House environment, energy and natural resources subcommittee, said last week.

Since the guarantee was granted, Tosco has raised its own estimates of the cost of the project 19 percent from \$3.1 billion to \$3.7 billion, and Exxon has indicated the project will cost closer to \$5 billion. Last Friday, calling the potential cost overruns "a very serious situation," the Synfuels corporation threatened to take away the federal loan guarantees.

The corporation asked Tosco for updated cost estimates and assurance that there is adequate security for the loan guarantee. The DOE reports suggest, however, that Tosco's ability to respond to that list is limited because of the company's limited role in the project. Exxon, which is not a party to the loan guarantee, owns 60 percent of the project and controls its design, cost, construction and operation.

"During the recent period of involvement with the Colony Shale Oil Project, it became apparent to the Denver-DOE staff that Oil Shale is being treated as a junior partner even though it is contributing more than \$1 billion to the project," according to a confidential report prepared in February by that staff.

"Oil Shale must become a more active owner and participant in the Colony Shale Oil Project in order to fulfill the requirements of the loan guarantee agreements as approved by the government and Oil Shale," the report concluded.

Tosco Vice President for Public Affairs Walter Klein called the characterization of Tosco as a junior partner on the sidelines as "just nonsense." Tosco Executive Vice Presi-

dent John Lyon said that Tosco had a better working relationship with Exxon than with previous participants in the project.

Klein said the DOE reports had not been provided to Tosco. From what he had seen, he said, the portions of those reports that had to do with cost estimates "appear to be garbled."

"There are a lot of things that are just overblown at this point," he said. "We also think that as time moves along, all these perceived problems will be taken care of." Klein noted that Exxon and Tosco had begun work on the project before the loan guarantee and that an estimated 1,600 people are employed by the project. He also questioned where the cost estimate purported to be Exxon's had come from.

Another report, prepared for DOE by Black & Veatch, a consulting engineering firm, concluded that Exxon's higher cost estimates were more accurate.

An Exxon spokesman said yesterday that Exxon has not submitted any definitive cost estimates based on detailed design to the government. Those figures will not be available till the end of 1982, he said.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1982]

U.S. RECONSIDERS TOSCO LOAN GUARANTEES AS COST ESTIMATES ON SYN FUEL PROJECT SOAR

(By Andy Pasztor)

WASHINGTON.—Escalating cost estimates have forced the U.S. to reconsider the terms of loan guarantees granted to Tosco Corp. for a multibillion-dollar synthetic fuels project the company is building with Exxon Corp.

In the past few months, Exxon has raised its cost estimates for the oil-shale project in Colorado to as much as \$5 billion from the initial \$3.2 billion estimate, according to federal officials.

Tosco disputes Exxon's estimates, contending that the final cost of the project will be around \$4 billion. Exxon hasn't received any federal help for its share of the project and hasn't signed any agreement with the government spelling out Exxon's construction plans.

The government, in light of the potential cost overruns, is looking for ways to better protect the \$1.1 billion in loan guarantees it granted to Tosco last year. Federal officials said they are trying to determine whether the higher cost estimates violate certain provisions of the loan guarantee agreement and thus warrant stricter government controls. The U.S. could even delay future drawdowns on the guarantees until Tosco and federal officials agree on new procedures to determine and track costs. Tosco is seeking to top more of its loans guarantees in the next few weeks.

COST ASSESSMENT

The U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corp., the government-backed corporation overseeing the project, is expected to take up the issue at a board meeting Friday. Several of the corporation's directors and senior officials are understood to be concerned about the potential cost overruns, but they aren't expected to take final action until additional studies are completed and Tosco provides a plan showing how it expects to repay the U.S.-backed loans primarily from cash flow generated by the plant.

Among the things the corporation wants to assess, according to federal officials, are whether Tosco would be able and willing to

shoulder an extra share of the costs and whether Exxon would be willing to increase its 60 percent stake in the project. Under extreme circumstances, the corporation could cut off all loan guarantees to Tosco and try to force the company to repay the approximately \$75 million of guarantees it already has tapped.

The government granted Tosco the loan guarantees after the company said it could borrow only a small part of the nearly \$1.5 billion it needed to cover its 40 percent share in the project. So federal officials are worried that if the projected cost overruns are accurate, Tosco may be unable to borrow the additional nonguaranteed funds it would require.

CONCERN OVER PRICING

In addition, the government is worried that higher construction costs would run up the price of the synthetic crude the plant will produce, making it noncompetitive with conventionally produced fuels. The Colorado project is scheduled to start producing 50,000 barrels of synthetic crude a day in 1987.

In Los Angeles, John Lyon, the Tosco executive in charge of the project, said the company isn't alarmed by the higher estimates and doesn't plan to reduce its participation in the project. Mr. Lyon said some of Exxon's recent cost projections included inflation estimates for unexpected problems, and he asserted that the estimates would eventually be lowered.

According to Mr. Lyon, most of the discrepancy between cost estimates developed by the two companies involves "different estimates of worker productivity during construction" and disagreement about the size of the contingency fund set up to deal with unexpected problems.

In Houston, Robert Larkins, head of Exxon's synthetic fuel operations, confirmed that company officials were reviewing cost estimates for the project and said final figures won't be available until year-end. Mr. Larkins declined to comment on which of Exxon's cost estimates are being discussed.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month, I introduced H.R. 5555, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982. This bill takes a moderate, constructive approach to the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act. It has three central purposes: First, to address problems like acid rain and toxic air pollutants that are not reached by the current act; second, to remove from the act unnecessary or unduly burdensome requirements on industry and the States; and finally, to try to stop the current EPA Administrator from attempting to dismantle the regulatory framework of the law.

The subcommittee did not adopt H.R. 5555 as I introduced it, and as over 30 Members of Congress cosponsored it. Rather, the subcommittee

adopted a series of amendments to the Clean Air Act very similar to H.R. 5252 as introduced. This subcommittee bill bears no resemblance to my proposal.

Let me briefly list my concerns about the bill the subcommittee reported:

It allows extensions until 1993 of the deadlines for achieving air quality standards, even though most of the standards can be met within the next several years.

It allows the relaxation of emission limits and schedules of compliance in areas that are not meeting the health-based standards.

It weakens requirements for new sources locating in dirty air areas by allowing construction without offsets and by allowing sources to build without installing the best technology proven in practice.

It largely does away with the requirement for automobile inspection and maintenance programs in areas that are not meeting air quality standards for auto-related pollutants.

It allows EPA to continue to allow factories in dirty air areas to modernize without installing pollution controls on new equipment.

It gives an economic advantage to dirty air areas without approved air quality plans.

It allows the steel industry an escape hatch from last year's stretchout legislation, which carefully limited the circumstances under which iron and steelmaking operations could get extensions of compliance deadlines.

It weakens the protection for national parks by allowing five exceedances per year of the class I short-term increments. According to EPA, this will double allowable emissions from new sources near these areas.

It fails to guarantee any protection for new national parks, or for other national areas that are now protected by the class II increments.

It relaxes pollution control requirements for sources locating in clean air areas.

It fails to take any action against acid rain, or interstate air pollution or toxics. In fact, some of the bill's provisions will make this problem worse. For instance, the bill gives retroactive immunity to tall stacks that were built against EPA advice in the 1970's. This will allow greater emissions than would otherwise be the case.

It doubles automobile tailpipe standards over the levels that are being achieved by new cars already on the road.

It guarantees auto and truck manufacturers that 40 percent of their production can fail the emissions standards without their having to take remedial action.

It allows EPA to base recall only on average emissions. It further allows auto and truck manufacturers to avoid

recall even when their vehicles are not in conformance with the standards.

It does away with any obligation of EPA to try to control truck emissions to the same extent that auto emissions are already controlled.

It does away with the concept of technology-forcing in setting exhaust standards for motor vehicles.

It totally excludes any State authority to regulate marine vessels even if EPA takes no action to control vessel emissions.

This bill clearly sacrifices the public interest to the self-interest of certain specific industries. In sum, it is reflective of a "more is less" philosophy: That more emissions of air pollution will somehow mean less of an air quality problem. But the reality is that more air pollution means more violations of health-based standards; more disease; more damage to crops and forests; and more obstruction of visibility in the pristine areas of the West. I hope that we can improve this bill in the full Energy and Commerce Committee to reflect these realities; and to reflect as well that the Clean Air Act is basically sound, and that its protections continue to be needed to assure that all Americans enjoy clear and healthful air. ●

STILL TROUBLE AT THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, what follows is an article written by John D. Lofton, Jr., in the March 1982 issue of the *Conservative Digest*. His tough questions and hard-hitting analyses have jabbed at the shortcomings of both conservative and liberal administrations.

Recently, he turned his pen on the Justice Department's attack on social conservatives at the Conservative Political Action Conference.

To the Attorney General's allegation that conservatives who oppose the new criminal code proposal are "exceedingly misguided" and "nit-picking," Lofton points out that the "nits" the Attorney General defends include an across-the-board lowering of penalties for dangerous criminals and the creation of "a clean slate for the Federal courts to write on."

I have in the past, as have many of my colleagues, brought attention to the fact that the Justice Department has very high visibility in that area that does not support, as Mr. Lofton points out, those traditional family values, which then candidate Reagan promised the American people. But let Mr. Lofton tell it in his own inimitable style:

[From the *Conservative Digest*, March 1982]

ATTORNEY GENERAL BLASTS CONSERVATIVES, REFUSES THEIR QUESTIONS (By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

Attorney General William French Smith stopped by the February Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington, D.C., fired from the hip a couple of hit-and-run editorial comments and then fled from the scene without taking any questions from the audience. All of which is too bad, because Smith owes conservatives answers about several subjects.

One so-called "unfounded" criticism that really bugs the AG is the charge that his department is populated by appointees that are not Reaganites, not supporters of the president and his views. Calling this allegation "absurd," Smith says:

"I chose our senior officials. And I have supported Ronald Reagan in every election campaign he has waged. The senior officials at the Department of Justice are fully supportive of the president's policies and are doing a masterful job of effecting those policies within the constraints of law."

But what is absurd is the AG's logic. It is a non sequitur for Smith to imply that because he is a Reaganite, therefore the people he has chosen are also Reaganites. This doesn't follow at all.

Take, for example, Deputy Attorney General Edward Schmults, a man who worked for Presidents Nixon and Ford and who had no Reagan connection whatsoever before taking his present job. By most accounts, Schmults is the man who runs the Justice Department on a day-to-day basis.

Last July, in an article in *Business Week* magazine, Schmults said that potential candidates for the judiciary are being given no litmus tests on the subjects of abortion, busing or voluntary school prayer. This despite the fact that the 1980 Republican Party platform specifically pledges the appointment of judges to all levels of the judiciary who favor traditional family values and who respect innocent human life. As a candidate and as president, Reagan strongly supported this platform.

In his talk to conservatives, the AG also attacked what he called the "mini-crusade" that has been launched against the proposed reform of the Criminal Code. Says Smith: These conservative critics are "exceedingly misguided." He adds: "They have relied upon mischaracterization, attenuated arguments, and even former provisions of the proposal that have been amended. Worst of all, they misconceive the significant strengthening law enforcement that would flow from enactment of the code now. After more than a decade of debate, we can no longer afford nit-picking that delays reform of the antiquated hodge-podge of federal criminal law."

Okay, so what exactly are the nits that conservatives are picking concerning the Criminal Code reform package backed by the administration? Well, the AG didn't say specifically and, as I have noted, he didn't stick around to be asked this question.

A recent article in the national conservative weekly *Human Events* says of the Criminal Code reform legislation: It contains "a number of mind-boggling problems seldom mentioned by the sponsors . . . In almost all respects, the changes sought would put a further liberal spin on a federal legal system already tilted to the left."

Example: The newest Senate version of Criminal Code reform would lower the max-

imum penalties for 75 out of 128 crimes. The House bills would lower penalties for 112 out of 128 crimes. The principal bills would establish a liberal sentencing commission consisting primarily of judges and defense attorneys which could virtually prohibit law-and-order judges from giving sentences in excess of the prison terms actually being served under current law.

Human Events says that perhaps the most important provision of the Senate bill is the section that mandates a sentencing commission that "shall be guided by . . . in cases involving sentences to terms of imprisonment, the length of such terms actually served" under current law. This means judges would generally be precluded from giving sentences in excess of the 62-month national average for murder, the 52-month national average for rape and the 23-month national average for felony convictions.

Human Events reports that legal experts note the basic problem with the Criminal Code reform is its concept: The idea of rewriting all our federal criminal law in one sweeping statute, throwing out centuries of case law and creating, as one sponsor puts it, "a clean slate for the federal courts to write on."

"Knowing what we know about the present crop of judges," the conservative weekly observes, "this is hardly reassuring; a fitting project for the French Revolution, perhaps—but not for an American Congress."

As I say, from the point of view of his conservative audience, it's too bad Attorney General Smith didn't take any questions about the subjects he raised. However, from the AG's point of view, his decision was a wise one.

William French Smith's department may be out of control. But this is obviously not something he was going to allow to happen to the conservative group to which he was speaking.●

POLLUTION IN THE NAME OF REGULATORY REFORM

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, as our Energy and Commerce Committee began its markup of H.R. 5252—the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982—the supporters of the legislation made two claims: First, they asserted that the Clean Air Act was strangling the States, EPA, and industry with bureaucratic redtape; second, the proponents suggested that H.R. 5252 would cut away that redtape without increasing air pollution. These are powerful claims and require close analysis.

No responsible party would argue that the Clean Air Act could not be streamlined. I along with Chairman HENRY WAXMAN of the Health Subcommittee attempted to do that. We proposed reforms, particularly in the areas of the State air pollution strategies—so-called State implementation plans or SIP's—and in the program to protect the National Parks—prevention of significant deterioration or

PSD. Unfortunately, our recommendations did not receive favorable subcommittee action.

Nevertheless, the process is continuing. And, the authors of the administration-backed legislation are persisting in their claims that H.R. 5252 will streamline the act and protect air quality.

These assertions have been challenged, in an eloquent and direct manner, by two organizations whose expertise on the Clean Air Act is unchallenged. The State and territorial air pollution program administrators and the National League of Cities have both forwarded their analyses of H.R. 5252. Their comments are interesting because they represent the individuals at the State level who are faced with the complexities and the protections of the Clean Air Act daily. Among their findings are the following:

Although H.R. 5252 is silent on the issue of acid rain, the Air Pollution Administrators advocate "(i)ntial strategies to reduce actual sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emissions . . ."

Both organizations urge a strengthening of the sections of the Act which deal with the Interstate Transport of pollution.

Both organizations are fearful that the deadlines for attaining healthful air—extended until 1993 under H.R. 5252—will provide few assurances that areas suffering air pollution problems will continue their measured march toward healthful air.

The organizations are critical of the sections of H.R. 5252 which amend the so-called non-attainment program of the Act. H.R. 5252 cripples this provision which is designed to redeem the air quality in dirty air areas.

I am inserting the full text of their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge my colleagues to review them; and, to inquire with their local and State air pollution agencies as to their attitudes toward H.R. 5252. Before you make a decision on this bill, we should all be familiar with the air pollution and public health consequences if this legislation becomes law.

STATE AND TERRITORIAL AIR POLLUTION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS;
ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICIALS

March 29, 1982.

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOFFETT: We are writing to you in your capacity as a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which is scheduled to consider H.R. 5252, amendments to the Clean Air Act. STAPPA and ALAPCO, the national associations representing state and local air pollution control officials, have followed with interest the subcommittee markup of H.R. 5252. Subsequent to the bill's introduction in December, our members and staffs have worked cooperatively with the sponsors in an effort to ensure that the bill's provisions are simplified, while still representing the interests of the public—namely, clean and healthy air.

While we have noticed some improvements made in the bill since mark-up began,

there are still a number of provisions in H.R. 5252 which are clearly inconsistent with the policy recommendations adopted by our full memberships. Since we have been requested to identify these differences, we respectfully offer the following comments:

1. Mobile Source Standards—STAPPA and ALAPCO oppose the changes proposed in H.R. 5252 relaxing the emission standards for light duty vehicles. As we testified in February and as our joint NGA/STAPPA/ALAPCO survey has shown, relaxations to the carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide emission standards will aggravate existing nonattainment problems, and force other attainment areas for these pollutants into nonattainment status. In addition, both associations are concerned with the aggregate air quality effects of other proposed mobile source changes, including innovative technology waivers, warranties, compliance testing procedures, etc.

2. Acid Rain—While H.R. 5252 is silent on the issue of acid rain, both STAPPA and ALAPCO recommend that steps be taken now to begin controlling the problem. Initial strategies to reduce actual sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emissions should be aimed at the most cost-effective methods and obvious sources. Both associations support the establishment of an emissions ceiling for sulfur dioxide, with further control reductions identified as additional research warrants.

3. Interstate Transport—STAPPA and ALAPCO support strengthening the interstate transport provisions of the Clean Air Act, particularly sections 110(a)(2)(E) and 126. The provisions of the existing act are inadequate to deal with both short range and long range transport of pollutants.

4. "Automatic Approval" of State Implementation Plan Revisions—H.R. 5252 includes a provision that would allow the EPA Administrator to pocket veto a proposed SIP revision indefinitely, leaving state and local agencies with only one recourse—litigation. STAPPA and ALAPCO strongly urge adoption of language (included in the original version of H.R. 5252) which would specify that where a SIP revision is not acted on by EPA within a finite period of time (e.g., 4 months), the revision would be deemed approved without the need for affirmative action by EPA.

5. Extensions to Deadlines—H.R. 5252 provides for case-by-case extensions of deadlines for all of the health-based standards up to 1993. While STAPPA and ALAPCO believe this extension may be appropriate for certain areas with severe and persistent carbon monoxide and ozone problems, we question whether extensions past 1987 are truly necessary for the other criteria pollutants. Extensions should be provided only when effective controls are already in place and no other recourse is reasonably available.

6. Relaxation of Air Pollution Requirements—H.R. 5252 allows a state to revise its State Implementation Plan (i.e., relaxing emission limits) to meet a later attainment date, once an extension was granted. STAPPA and ALAPCO recommend that this not be permitted.

7. Offsets—STAPPA and ALAPCO do not support the offset provisions of H.R. 5252. As STAPPA earlier testified, there is no reason to allow new source construction to cause increased emissions in areas where primary attainment deadlines have been extended beyond 1982. Both associations rec-

commend retention of the present offset requirements of the Clean Air Act.

8. Best Available Control Technology (BACT)—STAPPA and ALAPCO support a case-by-case BACT requirement for new sources emitting more than 50 tons per year of pollutants located in both attainment and nonattainment areas. While sponsors of H.R. 5252 have made some improvements in the definition of BACT from earlier versions of the bill, STAPPA and ALAPCO still oppose the language allowing agencies the option of equating BACT with NSPS (New Source Performance Standards) for all sources emitting between 50 and 500 tons of pollutants.

9. Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)—STAPPA and ALAPCO recommend eliminating short-term increments in Class I areas, provided an alternative mechanism for short-term protection is utilized. H.R. 5252 does not address the problems inherent in tracking short-term increments. STAPPA and ALAPCO oppose the provisions of H.R. 5252 which allow fugitive emissions of pollutants to be exempted from increment consumption.

10. Hazardous Emissions—STAPPA and ALAPCO agree that the current federal program for regulating hazardous emissions (Section 112 of the Clean Air Act) is not adequately developed and that the standard-setting process needs to be accelerated. While H.R. 5252 is silent on this issue, both associations recommend legislative remedy. Specifically, STAPPA and ALAPCO recommended that 1) the listing process be simplified, 2) sources of listed pollutants install BACT, 3) research on the degree of risk to health be accelerated, and 4) guidance be issued to assist state and local agencies in determining what additional controls are necessary.

11. Definition of Source—Both STAPPA and ALAPCO agree that major new sources should continue to be required to use BACT level controls. Allowing a new source to trade-off use of best controls against control of other pieces of equipment would likely create more emissions, over the years. This should be prevented.

We thank you for your consideration of our views and will be happy to continue working with you and your staffs in the months ahead.

Sincerely,
ROGER RANDOLPH,
President, Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials.

DANIEL J. GOODWIN,
President, State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1982.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National League of Cities is very concerned over certain amendments to the Clean Air Act reported last week by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment. We urge the Committee to reconsider these amendments in order to assure the Nation's commitment to clean air.

First, relaxation of the auto emission standards.—NLC strongly supports maintaining the present auto emission standards. Relaxation of the carbon monoxide standard can only be offset by more and better-enforced inspection and maintenance programs; relaxation of the nitrogen oxide standard would require more controls on in-

dustrial sources in order to meet the national air quality standard. Both alternatives would place a heavy burden on cities to compensate for the increase in auto emissions. The primary means for abatement of motor vehicle pollution remains direct and stringent controls on motor vehicles.

According to a survey by the National Governors Association and the State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators, relaxation of both the carbon monoxide and the nitrogen oxide emission standards would result in delays from one year to beyond the year 2000 for 38 metropolitan areas to meet national clean air standards. Considering that technology is available to reduce the tailpipe emissions, NLC believes that the delays that would result from the Subcommittee bill are unacceptable.

Second, weakening of the offset requirement.—NLC continues to support the offset requirement as part of a strong non-attainment program. Offsets allow economic growth without increasing air pollution and encourage the reduction of emissions that otherwise would not have occurred. The existing offset policy encourages the use of advanced technology in the construction of new facilities because greater reduction in the amount of new pollution requires less to be offset. It should also be noted that the economy as a whole benefits from the resulting growth in the pollution control industry.

A few cities (Seattle, Louisville, Houston, and San Francisco) have begun emission offset bank programs to encourage firms to reduce emissions and bank the reductions for future use as offsets. These programs provide an excellent opportunity for city officials and industry representatives to work together to facilitate economic growth and public health. City officials often find that they can take steps of their own to reduce pollution—for example, by using a less polluting type of asphalt in road paving operations.

The National Commission on Air Quality has found that offsets have generally been available at a cost that does not represent a substantial portion of the total project cost. In order to insure continued progress toward attainment, NLC strongly supports continuation of the offset requirement.

We also believe the Committee should act in one area not addressed in the Subcommittee bill—that of interstate pollution. The migration of pollution, including acid rain, from one area to another, is an increasing threat to many areas of this country and Canada. We agree that more research into the causes of acid rain is needed; however, we must begin to address the problem.

NLC supports the proposal of the National Governors Association whereby regional corridors would be established within which cities and states would negotiate pollution reduction. With this approach, a minimum reduction goal established by the Federal Government would be necessary to spur action. However, the process would be a flexible one, allowing individual state and local conditions to be considered. We believe this first step is needed while we continue to carefully examine the nature of the problem.

For local elected officials, reducing air pollution is a critical step in revitalizing and conserving our cities. The goal of cleaner air is equal to and inextricably intertwined with employment, housing, and economic development. NLC urges you to avoid any back-

sliding in the Nation's efforts to achieve cleaner air.

Sincerely,
FRED L. HARRISON,
President, Mayor of Scotland Neck.
ALAN BEALS,
Executive Director.

WHITEHALL HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● **MR. RITTER.** Mr. Speaker, while the Tarheels of North Carolina have emerged as the new NCAA national champions, we as Pennsylvanians of the Lehigh Valley also join in celebration for our newly crowned State high school basketball champions. The Whitehall High School Zephyrs of the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania won the 1982 Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association class AAA State championship by defeating the New Castle Hurricanes on March 28. The maroon-and-gold Zephyrs became the first Lehigh Valley team in 31 years to win the State championship. These champions wrapped up their winning season with an impressive 35 wins and 2 losses. Key Zephyr players—Scott Coval (most valuable player), Mike Bobyak, Glenn Noack, Carl Heydt, Lou Pizarro, Rick Steckel, Chris Newhard, Ron Strisofsky, Kyle Kern, Mark Molchany, Rick Scholl, and Rick Gladish—under the expert guidance and leadership of Head Coach Dick Tracy and Assistant Coaches Carl Case, Chester Pieczynski, and William Stickler—have brought great pride to the Lehigh Valley. We in the Lehigh Valley share in your Zephyr pride. From the team and its coaches, to Principal Clayton Northup, to the faculty, and Whitehall High's spirited student body, we in the U.S. Congress salute you for your fine efforts and congratulate you on this most noteworthy achievement.●

THE BUDGET AND ECONOMY

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● **MR. HALL** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, I delivered an address in Dayton before three important business groups in my district: the Dayton Area Board of Realtors, the Home Builders Association of Dayton and the Miami Valley, and the Dayton Area Auto Dealers Association. The members of all three groups have been severely affected by high interest

rates, joblessness, and the depressed economy.

I herewith commend to my colleagues my speech on those concerns:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL

If there is one common thread among auto dealers, realtors, and homebuilders, it is that you deal with the American dream. When President Roosevelt wanted to lift the spirits of a Depression-weary nation, it was a car in every garage that he promised. And it is home ownership that is the mark of success for nearly every family. More than any other symbols, the automobile and the home represent what Americans strive for—what they dream for.

And that dream, my friends, is in trouble. It is in trouble because the unemployment rate is unacceptably high. Jobless workers do not buy homes or cars. And even those with steady incomes are finding that the skyrocketing cost of credit has priced them out of the market.

You know better than I do that the number of housing starts here in Ohio has dropped from 66,000 in 1978 to 27,000 in 1981, a decrease of almost 60 percent.

You know that an estimated 1,600 automobile dealerships went out of business in 1980—nearly ten times the number that closed the year before.

And you probably heard last week that the Commerce Department announced the sales of new single-family homes in January, which dropped 23 percent below the sales in December, were at the lowest level in the last 20 years.

I doubt the latest proposals from the Administration are not going to help much.

Consider the President's proposed budget. According to the Administration's figures, the fiscal 1983 Federal budget will spill \$91.5 billion of red ink—the largest budget deficit in the nation's history. And, according to the budget blueprint, by 1985 the deficit will still be over \$70 billion in 1985.

That's the good news.

The bad news is that the Administration's figures are optimistic, and based on political and economic impossibilities.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's proposal will result in an actual deficit of \$121 billion in 1983, growing to \$140 billion in 1985. Worse still is the estimate by the House Budget Committee that the 1983 deficit could be as high as \$145.6 billion in 1982, and top \$168 billion in three years.

The differences are because the President has underestimated expenses, overestimated revenues, and made unrealistic predictions about future interest rates, the growth of the economy, and other economic factors. To compound these mistakes, he assumes Congress will cut a number of very popular programs that have bipartisan support in the House and Senate.

Let me give you some examples. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that farm price supports will end up costing \$5 billion more than the Administration figured. On the other hand, it estimates that receipts from leasing oil and gas rights from the Outer Continental Shelf will fall short \$5 billion from the Administration tally.

And the proposed savings by severely cutting back key Education for the Handicapped programs stand about as much chance of passing as a cut in Congressional salaries.

What does all this mean? Most likely, interest rates are not going to go down if Con-

gress approves the budget plan without major revisions.

If the deficit continues to rise, the Federal government must borrow more and more. It must compete with private business for a limited supply of capital, driving the price up.

The Administration proposal, not related to the budget, could create private jobs by establishing Urban Enterprise Zones. This is a bold step which holds promise, and I'm willing to support a test program.

The idea behind the zones is twofold—to increase inner city employment, and to encourage redevelopment and revitalization of depressed urban areas. This is accomplished by providing business and individuals with special tax breaks and exemptions from regulation. The concept behind this is similar to the Impacted Cities Bill I supported as a State Senator. That bill paved the way for the redevelopment of Court House Plaza in downtown Dayton.

Under the President's proposal, up to 25 zones could be designated each year for three years. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would make the selection on the application of State and local governments. Though it is too early to tell which cities will be selected, Cleveland has a headstart in Ohio, and some officials in Dayton have asked me about the idea.

I would also like to touch on the proposed New Federalism to turn power and administration of government programs from Washington to the States.

This idea is another bold step which could result in government improvement. However, it's not new. The idea was sharply debated by the Founding Fathers to determine how power should be divided between the Federal and State governments. Though power has gradually shifted to Washington, over the years there have been regular attempts to reverse the movement.

There are two major parts to the President's New Federalism. The first is a Federal takeover of the Medicaid program in return for the States taking over the food stamps and Aid to Families with Dependent Children programs. The national bill for Medicaid is about \$19 billion a year, and the combined expenses for food stamps and AFDC are \$16.5 billion. So, it seems about a fair trade.

The second provision would turn back to the states responsibility for more than 40 Federal education, transportation, community development, and social service programs. For a limited time, these programs would still be funded in part on the Federal level through a super excise tax trust fund. However, the states will ultimately be left on their own to come up with the cash.

The principle behind the New Federalism is a sound one. Washington is too far from the people. Washington has too much power. This trend *should* be slowed. But the question is whether the New Federalism is the best way to do it.

We cannot ignore the fact that one reason why Washington took control was to smooth out regional differences that created wide inequities in government programs. This was particularly the case with programs to aid the needy. Those regional differences have not changed.

Also, if we turn the programs over to the States without providing any funding, States will have little choice but to abolish them or raise taxes. The poorer States will have no choice at all.

The underlying goal should not be to eliminate as many Federal programs as pos-

sible because some think Federal government is bad and State government is good. Our efforts should be directed to consolidate functions that are now split among Federal, State, and local levels. The goal should be to provide the most efficient and effective government service.

There is no sense in reducing the power of the Federal government if the result will be 50 new Washingtons.

And we must not forget that the New Federalism is no substitute for getting interest rates down and employment up. Those should be our top priorities. For that reason, the New Federalism will take a backseat.

We need something else, something new, to get at these two problems.

What I would like to see is a "common sense" approach to these major economic problems. Perhaps it is too much to ask for in an age when officials find it easier to confuse than to enlighten, and everyone is afraid that a simple idea cannot possibly help our intricate balance of competing economic forces.

But it is also an era of radical, new ideas. Why not try something that hasn't been done before. I am speaking, of course, of common sense.

Let me make a few obvious suggestions.

Let's get the Federal deficit under control and work towards a balanced budget. That makes sense, doesn't it?

You cannot spend more money than what exists, not even if you are the government. When the Federal government tries—and it has been trying—inflation shoots up, exacting a hidden tax on everyone who saves money.

Or, the Fed tries to control inflation through a tight monetary policy, which drives up interest rates and people who must borrow money are hurt. Either way, people get thrown out of work and the economy is threatened.

One way to get a handle on budget is to freeze it at fiscal 1982 levels. Though I like the simplicity of this approach, I'm not sure it will be enough to reduce the deficit.

What we have to do is obvious. Go after the real fat in the budget.

The President has requested \$263 billion for defense in 1983, or almost 30 percent of the Federal budget—compared with a 1980 level of \$145.8 billion, or 24 percent of the budget.

This money is simply being handed over uncritically and uneconomically. If the Defense Department were scrutinized as closely as the human services departments have been, I am positive that we would come up with substantial savings without reducing our military capability.

Are we actually buying \$263 billion worth of national defense? No. The Pentagon can't even spend that large amount of money and defense contractors can't even absorb all the potential new construction.

Just last week I saw a report showing \$174 million worth of losses at one Navy Supply Center during one year. This kind of waste cannot be permitted in the Department of Education, in the Department of Health and Human Services, and it cannot be permitted in the Department of Defense.

We can require a greater contribution from Japan and our NATO allies for the defense that the United States provides them.

We can follow the recommendations of the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office to eliminate wasteful expenditures.

America does need a strong defense. I have supported, and will continue to support increased defense expenditures.

More targets for budget cutters are those pork barrel projects: dams, canals, and courthouses that merely subsidize private farmers, or make popular the Congressional sponsor. Cut them out. We can't afford them.

Still, another way to reduce the deficit is to eliminate unproductive tax breaks. The giant tax cut package passed last year contained a giveaway to oil companies of \$11.8 billion between 1982 and 1986 by reducing the windfall profits tax.

Another section, which should also be repealed, permitted companies to "sell" their losses to other companies as instant tax write-offs. More billions are being lost from that change, yet it is not creating new jobs.

The depletion allowance for oil and gas is a holdover from the long-gone days of cheap fuel when the government needed to subsidize energy production. This tax loophole will cost \$9 billion over the next five years. We don't need it. Cut it out.

These tax breaks should not be confused with the accelerated depreciation allowances to encourage business growth or the personal tax cut enacted last year. These will provide a stimulus to the economy by encouraging greater savings and increasing employment opportunities.

In the rush to balance the budget, we must keep in mind a common sense approach. If we are trying to increase employment, we cannot eliminate all employment and training programs. We should not eliminate necessary programs that cannot be duplicated by the private sector.

We cannot ignore scientific research, child nutrition, environmental protection, national parks, education, and other programs that are an investment in the nation's future. If we do, our neglect will come back to haunt us, or our children.

There are no easy solutions. Hard times are on us, and will be regardless of any proposal.

But by following some common sense procedures, we can pull out. The American spirit is wonderfully resilient. There is no doubt in my mind that the economy will improve, that our jobless will go back to work, and that the home builders and sellers, and the auto dealers will see an upturn.

When? No one knows the answer to that. But if the Federal government gets that deficit under control and puts people back to work, it's going to come sooner than later.

Congress owes it to the people who still have faith, who still believe in the American dream. And Congress owes it to you, who make that dream possible. ●

HOPKINS LAUDS KENTUCKY SCHOLARSHIP WINNER

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, Miss Elizabeth W. Vest, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis T. Vest of Cynthiana, is here in Washington to participate as Kentucky's finalist in the Veterans of Foreign Wars voice of democracy speech scholarship contest. I am

very proud of Elizabeth, who lives in my congressional district. Because her message is so poignant today, reminding each of us that the American dream can be achieved if we all work together to build a stronger America, I would like to include her speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe her speech can benefit us all.

We are farmers and statesmen—and building America together. We are doctors and soldiers and building America together. We are artists, factory workers, scientists, and clergy and building America together. We are the rich and the poor, Baptist and Catholic, black and white—and building America together. We are a multitude of peoples, ideas, and talents with a common goal—building a stronger America.

We are fortunate; we have much more to work with than did our forefathers, even more, perhaps, than the rest of the world today. We could branch out in any direction and build a stronger nation in the process. We could create a space-age society, and industrial giant, a cultural and intellectual haven, a peaceful fusion of many races. Sound impossible? Don't forget—a hundred or even 50 years ago—who would have thought that a man could walk on the moon.

Yes, we have it all, all the materials, the blueprints, the manpower. We have everything but the most important thing of all: inspiration—ambition. In short, we have lost sight of the most basic foundation of our society—the American dream. All too often our hearts seem hardened against the struggle for freedom, justice and peace which the American dream symbolizes. Somehow we have become too sophisticated, too cynical, too wary to allow ourselves to be led by a deep and stirring abstraction. This is unfortunate. How can we ever progress if we do not allow ourselves to be inspired? Why should we ever build if we do not believe that we can succeed? And how shall we ever succeed if we base our goals on anything but the quest for freedom, justice, and peace?

As past generations have learned, it is essential that we dream great things, that we set our eyes to the stars. Man's need to dream is a very real part of life that cannot be ignored. However, dreams of material possessions, power, and wealth are all false hopes that few can possibly expect to attain. Rather we need to focus on the spirit patriotic energy that the American Dream inspires. True, just as all dreams, this one does contain flaws. Yet the ideals which it upholds are strong, steady, and everlasting in our democratic society. Freedom is there for all to pursue; justice is mandatory; peace is the key word in foreign and domestic policy; and each of us is left to build his own life of happiness. Although abstract in quality, the actual realization of these goals is quite possible. Only by placing our faith in the American Dream can we ever hope to pursue common goals. And only by arriving at a common belief can we ever work together to build a stronger America.

When Emerson wrote "Hitch your wagon to a star", he offered the single most important antidote to a society in need of growth and strengthening. As long as we have our eyes set on a dream which has long proven worthy or our admiration we can indeed expect to achieve our goals as a nation. So whether we be farmers, doctors, soldiers, or ministers; whether we be black or white, rich or poor, Baptist or Catholic, we can find union in the struggle to reach our goals

if we all keep our eyes on the American Dream. ●

CHECK THE "FINE PRINT" IN WATT'S WILDERNESS OFFER

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, questions of what Secretary of the Interior Watt really means appear to reign supreme in considering the administration's Wilderness Protection Act.

While Mr. Watt has stated that wilderness lands are "special" and "should be preserved in their natural state," he has also proposed legislation that would open up these lands to mineral leasing after the year 2000.

This apparent contradiction has left many wondering what the true intent of Secretary Watt and the administration is with regard to wilderness areas.

On February 26, 1982, the Oregon Journal published an editorial which attempts to clear the air on this issue and answers some of the questions we all have been asking. As such, I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

CHECK THE FINE PRINT IN WATT'S WILDERNESS OFFER

Interior Secretary James Watt may make headlines when he proposes a moratorium on drilling and mining wilderness areas until the year 2000. But watch the fine print. Watt is a better friend of wildcat oil drillers than wilderness.

The Wilderness Society has accused Watt of a "duplicitous hoax," saying that the Reagan administration's bill actually would abolish the wilderness system at the end of the moratorium. By 2000, wildernesses would cease to exist unless Congress decreed otherwise.

"He's (Watt) trying to make himself look like a great conservationist, but he's just recognizing political reality," said Andy Kerr, associate director of the Oregon Wilderness Coalition, in what seemed an apt description.

Watt's "new" wilderness policy seems political, not of much substance. Last summer the Interior Department acknowledged that it was considering issuing leases in the Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana. Then in November it was discovered that three leases for oil and gas exploration had been issued in New Mexico's Capitan Mountain Wilderness.

Congressional reaction was harsh and Watt backed down. Under congressional pressure, Watt agreed in November to avoid issuing any leases in wilderness until June 1982.

House Democrats had Watt where they wanted him—he couldn't lease more wilderness areas because of congressional opposition, but the Democrats could hit Watt and the Reagan administration with the wilderness issue in this fall's congressional elections.

Then, last month, Watt may have slithered off the skewer. He announced he was extending his moratorium to one year,

which would move Watt and wilderness off the political fire until after the elections.

It should be remembered that existing law—the 1964 Wilderness Act—permits leasing in wilderness areas only until Dec. 31, 1983. Then a moratorium, on leasing but not on drilling, will take effect. So Watt's bill could bring the ban on wilderness leasing into effect earlier than Dec. 31, 1983, or remove it in 2000.

It may be that Watt's focus on wilderness areas is designed to obscure what Interior is doing on other federal lands, and that is to lease them to anyone coming through the door. The federal government administers 737 million acres, but only 80 million are in wilderness (the 1.1 billion acres on the outer continental shelf isn't included in these figures). Even before the Reagan administration was elected, wholesale leases were being granted throughout the West, including Oregon, and on offshore lands (not off Oregon). The other federal lands—not wilderness areas—are where the action is taking place and where future drilling for oil and gas should be monitored closely. ●

OBSERVANCES OF YOM HASHOA

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Dr. Aryeh Neshet, a respected leader of the international Jewish community, will be the main speaker at the Greater Hartford community's annual Yom Hashoa observance to be held on April 19 at the Emanuel Synagogue in West Hartford.

The commemoration will mark the 39th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and will pay tribute to the martyred 6 million.

Dr. Neshet's participation in this observance is a special honor for the Greater Hartford community. A survivor of the Holocaust, Dr. Neshet has served as executive director of Sherut La'am, the Israeli Peace Corps, director of the Israel Education Fund, and vice president of the University of Haifa.

Observances of Yom Hashoa will take place across this land on April 19. I wish to commend all who take time to participate in such ceremonies of memory. We must constantly remind ourselves and others of the Holocaust to insure that such a horror will never be allowed to occur again. ●

ARE LIBRARIANS BEING SHELVED?

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the University of Maryland is one of the out-

standing institutions of higher education in the United States and the site of the preeminent College of Library and Information Sciences. On March 2, 1982, the alumni association of that college conducted a meeting which featured a panel session on the subject "The Challenge of Change: Are Librarians Being Shelved?"

Gilbert Gude, Director of the Congressional Research Service and a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, addressed this group. I commend to my colleagues Mr. Gude's remarks, which serve to demonstrate the ever-increasing importance of the library profession, not only in support of our work in Congress, but in the Government at large.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE: ARE LIBRARIANS BEING SHELVED?

As we examine the role of the professional librarian in tomorrow's world, it is not redundant to emphasize two currently predominant phenomena of the United States democratic system: the growth of knowledge—the "information explosion"—and the expanding availability of information. Professional librarians have not been dragged into these areas of debate and action—far from it, for decades librarians have maintained a comfortable leadership role in adapting information science and technologies to the needs of American society and government. As a matter of fact, the exponential growth of information in two dimensions—in overwhelming quantity and in intricate complexity—has made the librarian's key role inevitable.

After all, the major task of the library professional—in an age in which automation and other advanced forms of technology are making sweeping changes—remains the same as it has throughout the ages: the acquisition of knowledge and information, its orderly processing and organization, and its dissemination to a public with a seemingly insatiable hunger for answers.

Let me tell you about the Congressional Research Service, where these interests have been reshaped to reflect the realities and modern, up-to-date technological developments of our time. Before addressing this topic, I wish to make special note of the proposed standards for Federal librarians recently issued by the Office of Personnel Management. If adopted, these standards will degrade both the purpose and meaning of the library profession. As you may have heard, this proposal, which I sincerely hope will not be issued in its present form, states that the Federal Government will no longer require advanced professional academic training for librarian positions. I mention this as an aside because it has import for all of us who are concerned about libraries and their role in information and research transfer and demonstrates the confusion and lack of understanding which prevails in many quarters regarding librarians and their role in our culture.

My comment this evening about the librarian in today's government will apply most specifically to the Congressional Research Service, but from it one can extrapolate government-wide—regardless of their agency's mission—the increasingly important services librarians render at all levels of public service. I am not a librarian—my career has mainly been in the legislative

arena—but the Congressional Research Service has presently more than 90 professional librarians in its Library Service Division, Reference Division, and seven Research Divisions. These librarians serve as part of the well-integrated team of 550 CRS researchers, analysts, and specialists who last year responded to more than 370,000 congressional requests.

One of our CRS cornerstone operations is maintained by the professional librarians in the Reference Division, who quickly respond to a large portion of the workload of requests which can generally be answered within three hours. Another keystone operation is performed by CRS bibliographers who constantly search 3,000 serial publications for articles and materials on subjects of legislative interest; congressional clients, as well as CRS analysts, continually access these citations in a number of modes in large quantities.

In addition to such conventional library operations, members of the Library Services and Reference Divisions—along with subject area specialists of the seven CRS Research Divisions—also serve as members of CRS interdisciplinary teams. These team librarians provide guidance to the many subject area resources—resources not always evident to non-librarian policy analysts; this work expedites and strengthens the research process for Congress.

As one might imagine, CRS librarians have continually improved the methodology of packaging information and research for legislative clients. One of the more recent innovations of the Reference Division is the Info Pack which has improved both the speed and thoroughness of response. An Issues Group—composed of representatives of the Inquiry Unit and the Reference and Library Services Divisions—monitors issues in critical subject areas, and in consultation with research division analysts, develops Info Packs on fast-breaking important issues such as El Salvador, block grants or the New Federalism. An Info Pack generally has one or more CRS Issue Briefs and/or Reports which are prepared by research specialists and analysts. Material from non-CRS sources and brief Library Services bibliographies broaden the scope of the Info Pack so it will comprise an oversight—get-up-to-speed tool—for the legislative client.

Our CRS professionals in the Library Services Division have recently developed another innovation, the Research Guide. A legislative assistant or committee researcher can use the Research Guide to identify that segment of subject area literature most relevant to his or her particular path of analysis; the Guide functions as a roadmap to the best material resources on a specific topic. It includes instruction in the use of printed indexes, online data bases, and provides the relevant search terms, as well as suggestions on the most pertinent literature to track for on-going research activities. The Research Guide saves time for the congressional staffer and at the same time trains him or her in the researcher's methodology.

The Guide is just one of the mechanisms which CRS has developed to involve the legislative staff person in the information-research process; another is the CRS Institute. The Institute consists of training programs for Member and committee staff; sessions include instruction by CRS librarians on basic reference and research techniques as well as training in how best to work with CRS librarians and subject area specialists in pursuing a particular line of inquiry. Thus, we in CRS work constantly to develop

a network-continuum among the Member and committee staffs in Congress and CRS professional staff. Within the Congressional Research Service itself and the research component of the larger congressional milieu on Capitol Hill, the professional librarian serves as an indispensable part of an integrated team.

Professional librarians are vital to quality research support of the legislative process as they are key to all comparable activities throughout the public sector; their role will not only expand because of continuing growth and complexity of information and research materials, but also because of the exciting new developments in automation. Any thought of the librarian of the future of course inevitably leads into the technology of information storage and retrieval: computers, in all their increasingly diverse forms. The librarians, with skills in controlling data, have been deeply involved in this revolution from the very first, and in the CRS, our librarians led the way. Today the computer is used in every one of our divisions, often in dramatically different ways. Our librarians operate a very large computer-based Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) program, which weekly provides subscribers with three-by-five card bibliographies in their subject area of interest. The SDI serves more than 400 congressional and committee offices who, in turn, ask for almost 50,000 hard copy printouts of the materials.

The librarians produce computer-generated bibliographies both for CRS researchers and congressional staff. We keep our Issue Briefs in the computer for continual update, as well as our Bill Digest information, and both of these can be retrieved in congressional offices. There are now some 1,000 CRT terminals in the Library of Congress and another thousand in congressional offices—all of them tied to the CRS data stored in the Library's central computer. Librarians design the retrieval programs as well as the subject terms and linkages. While our issue analyses and background reports are being written by our subject specialists, our librarians are organizing them for use so they can be retrieved efficiently and simply by non-technical users.

Increasingly, the CRS is linked with its clients by wire. This very week we are initiating an electronic mail system—a pilot project—which will permit congressional offices to place their inquiries directly into their own transmitters and the queries will come out on paper in the CRS Inquiry Control Unit for assignment to our researchers. We are working on devices by which the reports and articles used in our response will similarly come out on paper in the offices which initiate the inquiries. The librarians are working on ways that the various data sources can be tied in with this electronic conversation so the congressional offices of the next decade will dip into data storage from all across the country, in the same manner as we used to teach researchers to use reference books in the reading room.

As the information government acquires gets greater and more valuable, putting it into storage and getting it out gets more complicated and the librarian's role at both ends of the stream becomes more essential. In the CRS's experience, the librarian's part—rather than fading away—is becoming increasingly irreplaceable. This is true, of course, at all levels of government; the implications of the possible redistribution of governmental programs heightens our awareness of the corresponding critical role of the librarian at non-Federal levels.

In the legislative reference-research services of the 50 States, there are about 150 professional librarians today; the number varies in proportion with the size of the State. California has six professionals, New York, Louisiana and Illinois five each, Florida and Ohio three each. Their roles may well change by the Administration's proposal to redistribute responsibilities from the Federal to the State level.

Although the New Federalism's political fortunes are yet to be decided, the initiative of the Reagan Administration will surely bring about more public debate. City, State, and Federal legislatures and executive agencies could well see opportunities for a variety of proposals for reallocating functions among the various levels of government, and this will be just another factor increasing the research-reference workload.

Professional librarians are essential to quality research support of both the legislative and executive agencies throughout our American democratic system. In CRS, we have no concern about librarians being put on the shelf; our own experience is that they have never been more essential to our task of providing information and analysis to the Congress. ●

THE RAILROAD COST RECOVERY AND RETIREMENT FUND ACT OF 1982

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, the administration has embarked on a program to recover the Federal costs incurred in providing services, facilities, and financial assistance to the airways, the highways, and the waterways. It is currently proposing substantial increases in waterway user charges, but has no current program for the recovery of the many and varied drains on the Federal Treasury incurred by rail freight.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on fuel used in the transportation of property by rail for the purpose of recovering Federal costs of providing services, facilities, and financial assistance to railroads.

The bill I am introducing imposes a schedule of fuel taxes on railroads which is identical to the present fuel taxes imposed on bargelines. The taxes will start a return flow of funds to the Treasury which will initially be considerably less than full cost recovery of Federal financial assistance to rail freight.

The Congress has an overriding obligation to make sure that its cost recovery programs in transportation are evenhanded among the competitive modes. High taxes on barges with no corresponding taxes to recover Federal aid to railroads cannot be justified. The arguments employed by proponents of cost recovery for barge

freight apply equally to cost recovery for rail freight.

The initial taxes on rail freight are modest. Six cents a gallon would produce approximately \$240 million, far less than just the Federal subsidy of \$350 million a year paid into the railroad retirement fund, a benefit unique to railroads. One major reason this subsidy was provided over President Ford's veto was to relieve the railroad industry of pension cost increases which it would otherwise have had to bear. These cost increases, it was said at the time, would have handicapped the industry in its competition with trucks and barges.

A more substantial reason for establishing a cost recovery flow of funds from a user tax on rail freight is the current uncertainty over the future of the pension fund. The current troubles on the railroad retirement fund and the danger that it may soon become insolvent are too well known to be discussed in detail here. Already benefits have been reduced. There is concern by railroad labor about current proposals to abolish the fund entirely and bring railroad workers under social security. The establishment of a mechanism to recover future deficits in the fund from a charge on rail freight will help preserve the present railroad retirement system, an alternative which rail workers strongly prefer. I therefore suggest that the entire proceeds of this tax go into the railroad retirement fund.

The tax rises to 10 cents a gallon by 1985 and would produce at that time some \$400 million. This is far less than the funds currently obligated to subsidize Conrail alone which interchanges more than 70 percent of its freight with the rest of the railroad industry. Since Conrail provides the rail system with invaluable access to 40 percent of the Nation's manufacturing capacity, I believe it is appropriate to apply the tax evenhandedly to all rail carriers. I am aware of the administration's pledge to end Conrail subsidies, but many hundreds of millions are earmarked for the next few years, so there is justification for establishing a return flow immediately.

We do not know the cost to the Treasury of the unique tax subsidies accorded the rail industry in the Economic Recovery Act of 1981 for rapid depreciation of its so-called "frozen asset," the rail roadbed. However, they are very substantial, probably more than the Conrail and pension subsidies combined, and more than would justify starting a return flow from the users of rail freight services.

I am aware that there has never been a satisfactory and comprehensive compilation of the many ways in which rail freight is benefited by Federal aid and I am therefore proposing that the Secretary of Transportation

and the Secretary of the Treasury jointly undertake a study to identify and quantify all forms of financial aid provided by the Federal Government to the railroads. A report is due by the end of next year so that a permanent program of cost recovery can be enacted as soon as we have the factual data to develop such a program.

As a matter of equity, it seems to me that consideration of any increase in taxes on bargelines should be deferred until we have before us a parallel program for cost recovery from railroads. At that point, the two cost recovery programs can be considered together so as not to complicate the problems of maintaining competitive equilibrium.

I want to emphasize that this bill is not antirail transportation. It merely applies the same rational principle of user fees to recover Government subsidies to the rail industry as it already applies to those modes of transportation that compete with rail transport, such as trucks and barges.

This bill is not directed at rail shippers, many of whom are farm product shippers. In fact I have prepared this bill in consultation with representatives of various national farm organizations who agree that equity of treatment among the various modes of transportation utilized by farm product shippers can only benefit the user of rail transportation in the long term by not allowing any one mode to have an unfair competitive coverage.

This bill is fair to trucking and water transport industries without being unfair to the railroads. No mode should face a competitive disadvantage from a Federal cost recovery program.

In my home State of Tennessee, water transportation is essential to commerce. I think that the administration's proposal to raise user fees on water transportation without addressing the competitive disadvantage that it would create with rail transportation would be most unwise.

I also believe that this bill would provide a fair method of dealing with the solvency problems of the railroad retirement fund by shifting the cost from the general taxpayer to the rail companies and shippers.

At this point I insert an article from the American Farm Bureau News of November 30, 1981, and also a full text of the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[FROM THE FARM BUREAU NEWS, NOV. 30, 1981]

SUBSIDY, SUBSIDY—WHO GETS THE SUBSIDY? Disastrous Transportation War

Several months ago the nation's railroad industry set out on a lobbying campaign to convince the American public and members of Congress that the railroads had fallen onto hard times mainly due to the public subsidies being received by the motor carriers and barge lines, whereas the railroads had paid their own way.

The basic concept of trying to achieve competitive equity by attacking other modes of transportation was wrong from the beginning. Already it is coming home to haunt the rail carriers. It has now gone too far to be laid aside. Since the railroads have embarked upon such a multi-million-dollar campaign, much of which is misleading at best, the competing modes have no choice but to fight back. Shippers and receivers of freight have a definite interest in seeing that the truth is not obscured in this battle of the modes.

Farmers and ranchers have a long memory in dealing with the railroads. It was the monopolistic attitudes and actions of the rail barons that led to the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act before the turn of the century—and the main push for that legislation came from farm groups. Many railroads have never gotten completely away from that master/slave attitude. One of the reasons Farm Bureau gave qualified support to the basic concept of Staggers Rail Act of 1980 was that it hoped the Act would result in a new attitude of service to shippers and new freedom to compete in the marketplace with other rail carriers and with the other transportation modes.

The current internecine war has produced some actions on the part of the railroads that have a serious impact on the welfare of farmers and ranchers and the business of agriculture. These actions include the attempt to block the building of a new dam and locks at Alton, Ill. (in which they have the cooperation of the environmental movement); lobbying efforts against a uniform system of minimum truck lengths, weights and widths; and the current effort to convince the administration and Congress that the barge lines should be charged fees for use of the waterways to achieve total recovery of construction, maintenance and operation. They also include efforts to block the extension of the Highway Trust Fund and agitation to give the public the impression that the nation's highways are being worn out ahead of schedule because of the allowed truck weights, and that motor carriers should be paying a much larger share of highway-use taxes. They also have included well-financed efforts to block coal slurry pipelines.

Farm Bureau favors vigorous competition among the modes of transportation. Agriculture needs every form of transportation available. But it is ever mindful of the fact that the cost of the lobbying war ultimately will be paid for by shippers, receivers and consumers. Whatever user fees are enacted and collected will be passed along. The carriers merely will be the tax collectors. It is unfortunate that all of this money, management talent and energy to win the battle of the subsidy cannot be diverted to giving better service at a reasonable cost to shippers.

SUBSIDIES FOR ALL

In looking at subsidies to the various modes of transportation, it should be understood that no mode "comes to the table with clean hands." All of the modes of transportation have been subsidized by the taxpayers over the years, mostly for constructive and well-conceived purposes of overriding public interest. Because of tolls and other highway-use taxes, truck transportation has come closer to paying its own way than any other mode; but even there a certain portion of highway and highway-related costs have been paid and continue to be paid by property taxes and other taxes.

Only recently, Congress passed legislation providing for user fees on the inland waterway system. In the interest of achieving a balanced transportation system and with the ultimate goal of each mode paying its own way, Farm Bureau favored a reasonable system. It stressed that the funds derived should go into a dedicated fund, and that waterway transportation never be asked to pay for more than its fair share of the costs. Farm Bureau has never bought the concept that the total cost of construction, maintenance and operation of the inland waterway system should be borne by waterway carriers or shippers. Such work by the Army Corps of Engineers not only results from the needs of water transportation, but flood control, sources of water supply, environmental protection, regional development and recreation. Surely it is not equitable to lay all of these costs on one segment of the public. Probably no more than 60 percent of such costs should be recovered through fees collected by carriers and passed on to shippers and consumers.

RAIL SUBSIDIES

What about rail subsidies? Farmers and ranchers are not ready to swallow whole the railroad's point that subsidies they have received have been next to nil. Rep. James Florio (D-N.J.), chairman of the House Public Works' transportation subcommittee, was quoted in the Congressional Record as saying the government has paid \$11 billion in subsidies to the railroads over the past five years alone, while federal subsidies to barge lines do not exceed \$4 billion since 1824. The rail subsidies include massive payments out of the Treasury to save the Railroad Retirement Fund; the rescue of the northeastern rail system through the creation and subsidization of Conrail; and revenue derived from the land grants of more than a 100 years ago, in which several carriers were given 128 million acres of federal land and 49 million acres of state land, representing nearly 10 percent of the total land area of the continental U.S. Four western railroads received 88 percent of the grants.

All four of these railroads have formed giant holding companies or created conglomerate corporations for the purpose of separating the land and mineral assets from the railroad business. These companies now hold billions of tons of coal reserves, millions of acres of forests and untold wealth in petroleum reserves. Just recently, Congress voted to appropriate several million dollars to help finance a major rail classification yard in St. Louis; and, as part of the 1981 tax act, the railroads were given the right to start writing off about \$8 billion in rail track investment, some of which has been carried on the books since 1887. The railroads have long enjoyed a unique and very favorable method of accounting for track expenditures. Called "betterment accounting," it has amounted to a substantial subsidy to their rights-of-way and tracks. While the subsidies to the rail mode over a period of 50 to 100 years is unknown, it has been estimated in excess of \$50 billion.

NEW NATIONAL POLICY

A rail industry spokesman recently told railroad editors the industry he represents is not waging a holy war against the trucks and barges. He said the railroads support a new public policy that will end subsidies to all modes and force them to compete on the basis of market forces. Since the subsidy genie has been released from the bottle, Farm Bureau leaders will not be satisfied

with these words until they are turned into actions.

Secretary of Transportation Drew Lewis recently said that "the administration's transportation policy will build a strong national transportation system. It will raise the general priority of transportation among our national goals. Our policy must be, and I can assure you it will be even-handed and equitable among the modes." To construct such a new policy, it is important to know the facts.

THREAT OF RAIL MONOPOLY

The main reason facts are needed now is that the railroads are showing every sign of returning to old monopolistic ways. They appear to be more interested in crippling, restricting, preventing or ending competition than encouraging it or even living with it. Unfortunately, some of the recent Interstate Commerce Commission rulings seem to be aiding and abetting the rails, particularly in the commission's interpretation of the intent of Congress in providing a measure of protection for "captive" shippers where a rail line has market dominance.

Farm Bureau also sees this trend in the hurried movement toward rail abandonment, toward forcing the use of unit trains and in the area of mergers. It also can be seen in the actions of certain carriers, particularly Conrail, in canceling interline agreements, unilaterally adding on surcharges and refusing to accept traffic from other carriers.

The question has been raised by agricultural shippers, particularly in the Northwest, as to why the ICC, when considering abandonment and rate increase proposals, does not take into consideration the revenues the railroads or their holding companies derive from the millions of acres of land grants in calculating whether such railroads are earning a fair return. It's a logical question that deserves an answer, either by ICC or by Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY NEEDED

At this point Farm Bureau is ready to join with a number of other groups in calling for a thorough congressional inquiry to determine the value of the remaining land grant assets held by the railroads as well as the current income from such assets; the extent to which the ICC should permit rail services to be abandoned without considering revenue from the land grants; to recommend a policy on diversions of land grant assets away from the railroad companies; to determine if shippers have been charged too much because revenue from the land grants has not been taken into consideration; and to settle other related matters of subsidy to the railroads and other modes of transportation.

Congress also may need to take another look at the special railroad write-off provisions of the 1981 tax act. Certainly, if the railroads are to be allowed to write off investments going back nearly a century, such tax savings should be used to improve service, reduce abandonments or forego rate increases—in other words spent on rail service, not for purchasing other nontransportation companies, thus further diverting revenue away from rail service.

And without doubt, Congress needs to take a hard look at what the ICC has been doing in defining market dominance—or refraining from defining it—and the area of cost allocation. If the ICC is determined to cover its eyes and refuse to recognize market dominance or rail monopoly situations, then Congress should put a workable

definition into the Act, as Farm Bureau recommended during consideration of the 1980 act.

While the smoke of the modal war serves to divert the public's attention, is the nation going to end up with significantly less rail competition? If so, agricultural shippers and others may have no other option but to go to the Congress for reregulation. The danger is that we will end up with a handful of rail carriers, with little parallel competition. Congress might well conclude at that point to create one national system, all owned and beautifully managed by the government, like the Postal Service. It's better that the "flags" be raised now before the nation goes too far down that road.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of recovering Federal costs incurred in providing services, facilities and financial assistance to railroads, and to provide a new source of funding for the Railroad Retirement Fund

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Railroad Cost Recovery and Retirement Fund Act of 1982."

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—

(a) For more than four decades the objective of the national transportation policy has been to develop, coordinate and preserve an intermodal transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service and of the National Defense.

(b) The Congress finds that the long-standing national policy for the development of a competitive and coordinated water-rail transportation system has contributed materially to the growth and development of domestic and foreign commerce and that the preservation of effective water-rail competition and coordination requires that government policies be applied evenhandedly among the transportation modes.

(c) At present a fuel tax is imposed on water carriers but no comparable charge is imposed on railroads, even though railroads and water carriers compete vigorously with each other for freight.

(d) The Congress finds that the tax on fuel used in commercial transportation on inland waterways will affect the competitive equilibrium between the water and rail modes and destroy effective water rail competition and coordination, unless appropriate taxes are levied for rail freight transportation.

(e) The Congress finds that the Railroad Retirement Fund is in danger of possible insolvency and a new source of financial resources for that fund must be provided to preserve it.

TITLE I—TAX ON FUEL USED IN FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION BY RAILROAD

SEC. 101. IMPOSITION OF TAX.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed a tax on any liquid used as a fuel during any calendar quarter in the transportation of freight by railroad.

(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be determined from the following table:

<i>If the use occurs—</i>	<i>The tax is—</i>
After January 1, 1982 and before October 1, 1983.	6 cents a gallon.
After September 30, 1983 and before October 1, 1985.	8 cents a gallon.
After September 30, 1985...	10 cents a gallon.

(c) DATE FOR FILING RETURN.—The date for filing the return of the tax imposed by this section for any calendar quarter shall be the last day of the first month following such quarter.

TITLE II—STUDY OF AIDS TO RAILROADS

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of the Treasury jointly shall undertake a study to identify and quantify all forms of financial aid or assistance which have been and are provided by the Federal Government to railroads engaged in the transportation of freight. Such study shall consider, but shall not be limited to, direct grants, loans, guarantees, purchase of securities, special tax provisions and benefits, pension fund payments, current value of land grant lands and mineral interests therein held by railroads and affiliates thereof and past, current and prospective income from such land grant lands and interests therein. A report setting forth the findings of such study shall be submitted on or before December 31, 1982.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation not to exceed \$150,000.00 in the aggregate to carry out the study required by this section.

TITLE III

Proceeds of this tax shall be used to finance any deficit which would otherwise occur in the Railroad Retirement Fund.

REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH ON THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are beginning as never before to address the most critical issue of our time, the threat of nuclear war. The special order on this topic which we will engage in today is truly a remarkable historical occasion. There can be no more important subject for congressional debate and discussion. Recently, Representative TIM WIRTH wrote a highly informative editorial piece for the Boulder Daily Camera on this topic of the nuclear arms race, and I would like to include a copy of it in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Boulder Daily Camera, Feb. 28, 1982]

THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IS BLOCKING OUR WAY TO AN EFFECTIVE MILITARY
(By Timothy E. Wirth)

(Editor's note: Boulder voters last fall approved a local initiative on a congressional resolution calling for a nuclear weapons moratorium. This is Rep. Tim Wirth's response to that vote.)

The voters of Boulder sent the people of the world a message of hope by calling for a nuclear weapons moratorium in November's election.

No task confronts humanity as urgently as stopping the nuclear arms race. For a quarter of a century, the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States have failed at this task.

Together, the two nations possess more than 50,000 nuclear weapons, with the explosive capability of 24,000 pounds of TNT for every man, woman and child in the entire world. In the next decade the two governments propose to add 20,000 new nuclear weapons and a new generation of delivery systems which make possible serious discussion of "winnable" or "limited" nuclear wars.

But there can be no winners in a nuclear exchange. Between 70 million and 160 million people in the United States would be killed immediately, and from the results of the destruction of the fabric of society—from lack of medical care to contaminated water to radioactive soil.

Thanks to technological advances, the first nuclear "hit" would occur only thirty minutes after a decision was made to fire weapons. Bomb shelters and civil defense plans are not solutions.

The subject of nuclear war has been largely off limits for the past 35 years. Secrecy shrouds many military details. Both superpowers have been stymied by fear of the other, while steadily increasing their arsenals and claiming only more nuclear weapons can prevent nuclear war.

Average citizens, it has long been assumed, live under a mantle of powerlessness when it comes to the topic of nuclear war. Such feelings are not surprising. It is much easier to block the subject from consciousness, or to feel cynical, or to dismiss what

the voters of Boulder told the world last fall as an exercise in futility, than it is to confront the subject.

But the threat of nuclear war must be addressed, or the possibility of nuclear war will continue to grow. Retiring Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear navy, recently told the Congress in no uncertain terms of the magnitude of the danger.

The list of nations joining or on the brink of joining the nuclear club grows longer each year. Skills of scientists and workers, urgently needed to solve peaceful problems are diverted into nuclear weapons development. Hundreds of billions of dollars desperately needed to feed and clothe people, to supply jobs and health care—around the world, continue to be poured into nuclear weapons.

The Administration's 1983 budget proposal, with a \$26 billion allotment to the Department of Defense—an 18 percent increase over last year's huge jump, is not a hopeful sign. I believe we must strengthen our nation's defense, but a big expansion of nuclear forces does not address our key defense weaknesses. U.S. weaknesses exist because of our failure to invest in better training and more skilled manpower, in necessary equipment and spare parts, and in effective conventional weapons systems. For too long, those needed investments have been sacrificed for the sake of pouring billions into an ever-expanding nuclear arsenal.

With so much military effort oriented to developing nuclear weapons, we have tended to forget the importance of quick-thinking people in our military. A recent study of 23,000 recruits at the San Diego Naval Base indicated that 37 percent of them could not read at tenth grade levels.

Many Army combat companies have a personnel turnover rate of 25 percent every three months, the highest in the world. This is damaging to morale, and eventually to effective military preparedness.

Further, military training issues need to be addressed. We need to put much more emphasis on teaching future military leaders history and independent thinking. Military victories rely much more on the ability to react with flexibility and speed than on dependence on a centralized communications system.

We also need to de-emphasize our military's fascination with high technology weaponry that may not work, when simpler solutions make more sense on the battlefield and cost far less. For example, the new armored bulldozer (ACE) proposed by the Pentagon is a tremendously sophisticated new machine whose primary purpose would be to follow around the new M-1 tank to dig holes for it. Instead of spending \$1 million per bulldozer, a blade attached to the M-1 at a cost of \$80,000 would be as safe in a battlefield situation.

These are just a few of the ways that our nation should be addressing our defense needs, but the continued escalation of the nuclear arms race addresses none of these concerns. The fact that doctors, scientists and religious leaders from around the world, and millions of American and Europeans are now seriously addressing the off-limits topic of nuclear war is a hopeful sign.

National polls continue to show widespread support for the reduction of tensions and dangers involved in the nuclear arms race, and there is no reason to believe that the Russian people do not also support reduction of this tension.

The proposal for U.S.-Soviet negotiations leading to an immediate freeze on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons to their targets, appears to be a sensible approach to this most difficult problem. While I favor the current Administration effort to reduce nuclear weapons in Europe, and supported the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, a freeze on any further development of nuclear weapons would be a more dramatic and effective move. It would send an important message to other nations, and improve the climate for further efforts to establish lasting international peace.

I stand ready to introduce a resolution in Congress calling on the President to begin negotiating a moratorium on further nuclear weapons when grass roots momentum around the nation has strengthened.

Because the leadership of both nations has been so unsuccessful at halting the nuclear arms race, it is imperative that citizens around the world become involved in changing the climate, and demand that their governments act. ●